

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2272 of 2025

=====

Safina Khatoon Wife of Abdullah, Resident of Village and P.O.- Hasanpur,
P.S.- Naokothi, District- Begusarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through its Director, I.C.D.S., Directorate, Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. Director, I.C.D.S., Directorate Social Welfare, Department Bihar, Patna.
3. Divisional Commissioner, Manager
4. District Magistrate, Begusarai.
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Begusarai.
6. District Programme Officer, Naokothi, Bakhri.
7. Child Development Planning Officer, Begusarai.
8. Block Development Officer, Begusarai.
9. Mahila Supervisor, Begusarai.
10. Chetna Parkhar Wife of Pankaj Kumar, Resident of Village- Hasan Bazar, Naokothi, District- Begusarai.
11. Sudha Kumari Wife Shambhu Thakur, Resident of Village- Hasan Bazar, Naokothi, District- Begusarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Md. Nazir Ansari, Adv. Md. Abu Shajar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. K P Gupta, GP-10 Mr. Satya Vrat, AC to GP-10

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 18-02-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved with the order dated 12.09.2024 passed by the respondent Divisional Commissioner, Munger in Anganwadi Service Appeal No. 27 of 2023 to the extent whereby, the application of the petitioner for intervention in the matter came to be rejected.



3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that serious irregularities have been committed in the selection process, in which the petitioner was one of the aspirants and this fact has been brought to the knowledge of the Divisional Commissioner by filing an intervenor application through Annexure-P/8, but the same came to be rejected in most arbitrary manner. It is the contention of the petitioner that the intervenor application of the petitioner was necessary to be allowed, so that the entire dispute may be set at rest. However, non consideration of the intervenor application has opened a gate for another round of litigation, apart from prejudice caused to the petitioner.

4. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State has drawn the attention of this Court to the order of the Divisional Commissioner dated 12.09.2024 (Annexure-P/1) and contended that the dispute before the Divisional Commissioner was *inter se* between respondent nos. 10 and 11. Moreover, the petitioner being aggrieved with the alleged irregularities, in the selection process had already approached before the concerned CDPO, in terms of Clause-11 of the Anganwadi Sevika and Sahayika Selection Guidelines 2019, by filing Complaint Case No. 02 of 2023.

5. Considering the submissions advanced on behalf of



the parties and taking note of the nature of the prayer, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly, the same stands disposed off with the liberty to the petitioner to pursue her remedy before the competent authority.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

U			
---	--	--	--

