

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10241 of 2025

=====

Shanti Kumari Sinha, W/o Late Chandrika Prasad, Resident of Mohalla-
Ramjeechak Bataganj, Jahajghat Road, P.S.- Digha, District and Town-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Old Secretariat, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Health Department, Government of Bihar, Vikash Bhawan, Patna.
3. The Director-in-Chief, Health Service, Government of Bihar, Vikash Bhawan, Patna.
4. The Superintendent, Patna Medical College and Hospital, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Surendra Mishra, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Addl. Advocate General (09)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 07-07-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved with the action of the respondent in not extending the benefit of 1st and 2nd A.C.P. as well as 3rd M.A.C.P., despite the fact that the petitioner being entitled and superannuated on 31.12.2011 as Nurse Grade A from Patna Medical and Hospital after serving about 34 years of service. The petitioner was duly appointed as Lady Health Visitor and posted in the office of Civil Surgeon-cum-Chief Medical Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram long back in the year 1978. After serving so many places, finally the petitioner was transferred to Patna Medical College and Hospital long back in



the year 2003.

3. While the petitioner was posted in P.M.C.H. as Paricharika Bahan, Director-in-Chief Health Services, Government of Bihar issued guidelines under letter no. 286(6) dated 13.04.2010 regarding continuance of service with effect from the initial appointment of the identically situated persons as also for extending the benefit of A.C.P. to Nurse Grade A (Paricharika Grade 1) who were promoted from the post of Lady Health Visitor. In the light of the aforesaid letters, other identically situated persons, whose names have been mentioned in paragraph no. 9 of the writ petition, have been extended the benefit of Assured Career Progression; however, discrimination has been caused and the petitioner has been deprived from such benefits. In the mean while, the petitioner came to be superannuated on 31.12.2011.

4. Learned Advocate for the State prayed for time to seek instruction.

5. Considering the relief sought for in the writ petition and the averments made therein in support of her claim, this Court deems it fit and proper to direct the respondent no. 4 to consider the representation of the petitioner, the copy of which is placed as Annexure 4 series to the writ petition,



preferably within a period of 12 weeks’ from today and dispose off the same by a reasoned and speaking order.

6. Suffice it to observe that in case the claim of the petitioner finds favour, necessary consequential order shall be passed within the period stipulated.

7. The writ petition stands disposed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

