

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6747 of 2025

=====

Kanchan Kumari W/o Praveen Kumar Mandal, Resident of Village- Simariya,
Panchyat Simariya, Ward no.-02, Block Triveniganj, P.S.- Triveniganj,
District- Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Collector, Supaul.
3. The District Programme Officer (I.C.D.S), Supaul.
4. The Child Development Project Officer, Triveniganj, District- Supaul.
5. Aarti Kumari, Wife of Baijnath Kumar, Resident of Village- Simariya, Anchal Simariya, Ward no.- 2, Block- Triveniganj, P.S.- Triveniganj, District- Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Abdul Mannan Khan, Advocate
		Mr. Hafiz Shahbaz Asif, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar, AC to SC-23

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 20-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

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

“For issuance of an appropriate writ(s), order(s) direction (s) for quashing the order dated 31.01.2025 in Aganbari Appeal Case no.10/2023 passed by the respondent Collector, Supaul by which he has allowed the appeal filed by the respondent no.5 and further directed to the



*District Programme Officer, I.C.D.S, Supaul
to issue appointment letter in favour of
respondent no.5”*

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order passed by the Collector, Supaul, dated 31.01.2025, passed in Anganwari Appeal No. 10 of 2023, is not sustainable in the eye of law, whereas the order passed by the D.P.O. ought to prevail. The reason assigned is that the appointment in question was made in light of the Guidelines of 2016, and there is a deficiency under Rule 5 of the said Guidelines of 2016, as the name of the private respondent (appellant) was not present in the *Panchayat Nirwahan Niyamawali, 2016*, and this aspect was completely ignored.

4. Counsel further submits that the Collector, Supaul, while passing the order, completely ignored this aspect of the matter, therefore, he submits that interference is required and notice be issued to private respondent No. 5 in this case.

5. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, submits that the issue of non-entry of the appellant's name in the *Panchayat Nirwahan Niyamawali* has been duly considered and discussed. He further submits that the District Magistrate conducted an inquiry by obtaining written as well as oral inputs from the *Mukhiya, Sarpanch, Panch, and Prakhanda Pramukh,*



and also verified the earlier *Panchayat Matdata Niyamawali*. Considering all aspects of the matter, the order was passed, and there is no need for any interference with the said order.

6. After hearing the parties and perusal of the record, it transpires to this Court that the Collector, Supaul, at the time of passing the order, has considered the earlier *Panchayat Matdata Suchi* and the report of the B.L.O., *Mukhiya, Sarpanch, Panch, Prakhand Pramukh*, as well as the *Panchayat Aam Nirwachan Niyamawali* of the relevant years, and thereafter passed the order.

7. Therefore, this Court deems it appropriate not to interfere with the said order.

8. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

