

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10646 of 2025

=====

Sunita Patel W/o Birendra Prasad, Resident of Village - Mahodipur, P.O. -
Chailabhar, Ward No. 12, P.S. - Majhauilya, District- West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, ICDS, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Tirhut Division, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Collector- cum-District Magistrate, West Champaran at Bettiah.
6. The District Programme Officer, West Champaran at Bettiah.
7. The Child Development Project Officer, Majhauilya Block, Majhauilya, District- West Champaran.
8. Poonam Kumari W/o Bipin Kumar Resident of Village - Mahodipur, P.O. - Chailadhar, Ward No. 12, P.S. - Majhauilya, District- West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Jitendra Kumar Roy, Standing Counsel (13)
		Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, AC to SC-13

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 14-07-2025

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and
learned Counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed with
the following reliefs:-

*“A. For issuance of a writ in
the nature of certiorari or any other
appropriate writ, order/s, direction for the
followings :-*



I. To quash the order dated 21.04.2025 passed by the respondent no. 4 in ICDS Revision case no. 132/2024 whereby and where under the order dated 20.06.2024 passed by the respondent no. 6 in Anganbari Sevika/Sahaiyika Appeal No. 28/2022 has been upheld (Annexure- P/8).

II. To quash the order dated 20.06.2024 passed in

Anganbari Sevika/Sahaiyika Appeal No. 28/2022 passed by the respondent no. 6 in Anganbari Sevika/Sahaiyika Appeal No. 28/2022 whereby and where under the order dated 06.04.2022 contend in memo no.229 passed by the respondent no.7 selecting the petitioner for the post of Anganbari Sevika has been set aside (Annexure-P/7).

B. For issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, appropriate writ/s or any other order/s, direction for the followings:-

I. To treat the annexures-P/8 and P/7 to be nullity and non-est in the eye of law.

II. To hold that the impugned orders are illegal and against the materials available on the record and the same have been passed without considering the relevant provisions of the guideline-2019.



C. For any other relief/s to which the petitioner is found entitled to.”

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has got higher marks than the private respondent, but in connivance with each other the respondents have not considered the case of the petitioner and the Aam Sabha has selected the private respondent. Learned Counsel further submits that in appeal as well as in revision his case has also not been considered. He submits that copy of the original marks sheet is attached in the writ petition by which it is apparent that the marks has obtained in the year 2013 itself, then there is no question for non-production of marks sheet which has already been issued.

4. Counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the question of marks is not only involved in the case, the form indicates that the punishment has been imposed on the petitioner because the petitioner itself indicated in the form that whether he is punished? In which the petitioner has indicated yes.

5. In response thereof, the Counsel for the petitioner submits that the said entry is basically filled up due to mistake, for which a categorical indication has been made in the writ petition. Counsel submits that petitioner is absolutely a



genuine candidate and his case must be considered.

6. Considering the submissions made by the parties, it transpires to this Court that the petitioner herself admits that at the time of filling the form mistake has taken place and that mistake had not been rectified by the petitioner on time. In this view of the matter, this Court has no option but to dismiss this writ petition.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	18.07.2025
Transmission Date	

