

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.3452 of 2022

=====

Rinku Devi Wife of Rupa Paswan, resident of Village-Chandrakaithi, P.O.-
Chandra Kaithi, P.S.-Chenari, District-Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Rohtas, Sasaram.
4. District Programme Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram.
5. Child Development Project Officer, Block Chenari, District-Rohtas, Sasaram.
6. Pinki Kumari, Wife of Chandan Paswan, Resident of Village-Chandrakathi, P.S. and Block-Chenari, District-Rohtas.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukul Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S.K. Mandal (SC-3)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 28-01-2026

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

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the selection letter dated 12.04.2018, by which respondent No.6 was appointed on the post of Anganbari Sahayika.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the selection has been made on the basis of forged and fabricated documents of respondent No.6. He submits that he has moved before the District programme Officer making objection with



regard to appointment of respondent No.6 vide Annexure-7. According to Rule 12 of the Anganwari Sevika/Sahayika Margdarshika, 2016. He submits that on his objection action has been taken and Committee was formed. Counsel submits that the C.D.P.O. has entertained the complaint and disposed off the same. Counsel submits that vide Annexure-8, it has been found by the C.D.P.O. that the certificates are forged and fabricated but no action had been taken. Therefore, Counsel submits that Selection Letter dated 12.04.2018 be set aside and at the place of respondent No.6 petitioner be appointed.

4. Learned Counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that it is true that objection has been made by the petitioner against the appointment of respondent No.6. The C.D.P.O. has called for the report from the concerned School and Headmaster of the School upon verification submits that the certificate was genuine and, therefore, no action was taken.

5. After hearing the parties, certain points which are very much clear that appointment of respondent No.6 is guided by the Anganwari Sevika/Sahayika Margdarshika, 2016 and under the Anganwari Sevika/Sahayika Margdarshika, 2016 Rule 12 states about the entertainment of the complaint relating to any appointment by the District Programme Officer. It



transpires to this Court that complaint has been filed against the said appointment under which District Programme Officer has to pass order, but from the pleadings and documents on record, it transpires that the District Programme Officer, Rohtas, Sasaram, had not passed any order on the said complaint. It is due to this reason, this Court, without entertaining into the merit and demerit of the case, hereby directs respondent No.4, the District Programme Officer, Rohtas at Sasaram, to follow the law laid down under Rule 12 of the Anganwari Sevika/Sahayika Margdarshika, 2016. According to which, District Programme Officer upon receiving the complaint shall pass order based on evidence and hearing both the parties. As such, he shall pass order within 60 days from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order before him.

6. The time of 60 days shall be counted from the date of appearance of both the parties before him.

7. With this direction, the writ petition stands disposed off.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	31.01.2026
Transmission Date	

