

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4757 of 2026

=====

Sonali Kumari Wife of Sri Jyotish Kumar, Resident of Village Saraiya, P.S. Bakhtyarpur, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector cum District Magistrate, Patna.
3. District Program Officer cum First Appellate Authority, Integrated Child Development Services, Patna.
4. The Child Development Project Officer, Bakhtyarpur-Belchhi, Patna.
5. The Supervisor (Female), Anganwadi Centre No. 290, Ward No. 08, Village Saraiya, Gram Panchayat-Misi, Block-Bakhtyarpur, P.S.-Bakhtyarpur, District-Patna.
6. Smt. Ranju Devi, Wife of Ravindra Chaudhri, Daughter of Parmeswari Chhauthari, Resident of Village Saraiya, Ward No. 08, P.S.-Bakhtyarpur, District-Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arjun Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Pleader (20)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 31-03-2026

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

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

*“(i) To issue an appropriate writ
in the nature of certiorari quashing / setting
aside the order passed Vide Memo No. 379
dated 20.02.2026 in Appeal Case No.*



14/2024 by the District Program Officer-cum-First Appellate Officer, Patna whereby being obliged and directed by the order dated 13.11.2024 passed in Anganwadi Appeal Case No. 02/23-24 Kumari Ranju -vs- District Program Officer, Patna and Sonali Kumari the District Program Officer, Patna has rejected the appeal of the Petitioner observing that the selection and appoint of the Petitioner as Sahayika Sevika for Anganwadi Centre No. 290, Village Saraiya, Ward No. 08, Gram Panchayat Misi, Block- Bakhtyarpur District Patna is not as per Anganwadi Sevika /Sahayika Appointment Guidelines 2016 and further the direction was given to select and appoint the Respondent No. 06 for the post of the same as the order is not legal as per the prevalent law of the State.

(ii) To issue an appropriate writ in the nature of direction or directions to the Respondent Authorities to continue the Petitioner for the post for which she was selected and appointed and worked for approximately 8 years and the same cannot be done after a long period of time.

(iii) To issue any other writ/writs and/or direction /directions to the respondents as your Lordships may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of



the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the State raised preliminary objection and submits that in the second round of litigation, after remand by the District Magistrate, the petitioner moved before the District Programme Officer and, then, directly come before this Hon’ble Court without preferring the appeal. He submits that the actual remedy available to the petitioner only before the appellate forum and not directly before this Hon’ble Court.

4. This Court after hearing the parties is of the firm view that the argument made by the learned Counsel for the State is completely in accordance with law. The petitioner ought to move before the appellate forum first. It is due to this reason, this writ petition is dismissed. The delay, if any, in filing the appeal is directed to be condoned.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	01.04.2026
Transmission Date	

