

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7430 of 2020

=====

Archna Devi W/o Mahendra Pratap Singh, Resident of Jagirahan, Post-Thakrahan, Dhumnagar, West Champaran Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Director Child Development integrated Programme Indira Bhawan, Boring Canal Road Patna.
2. The Director Child Development Integrated Programme Indira Bhawan, Boring Canal Road Patna.
3. The Commissioner Tirut Range Muzaffarpur.
4. The District Magistrate West Champaran Betiya.
5. The District Programme Officer West Champaran Betiya.
6. Afsana Khatoon Wife of Iqbal Ahmad Resident of Village- Bhatawa, Panchayat Jagiraha, Ward No. 02, P.O.- Koirpatti, P.S.- Thakraha, District- West Champaran.
7. Sanju Devi Wife of Uma Chaudhari Resident of Village- Bhatawa, Panchayat- Jagiraha, Ward No. 02, P.O.- Koirpatti, P.S.- Thakraha, Districe- West Champaran.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Mishra, Adv. Ms. M. Jaiswal, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar Mandal, SC-3 Mr. Bipin Kumar, AC to SC-3
For Resp No.6	:	Mr. Md. Kamaluddin, Adv.
For Resp No.7	:	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

28 02-07-2026 Heard learned Advocates appearing for the respective parties.

2. The challenge in the present writ petition is made to the order dated 06.03.2020 passed in ICDS Appeal No. 273/2019, whereby the order dated 12.10.2019 passed by the District Programme Officer has been upheld. The petitioner has



also questioned Memo No. 1386 dated 12.10.2019 and has prayed for a direction upon the respondent authorities to reinstate her.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submitted that the impugned orders are wholly unsustainable in law as the authorities have travelled beyond the scope of the allegations contained in the show-cause notice and have decided issues which did not even form part thereof.

4. At this juncture, learned Advocates for the private respondents interjected and submitted that during the pendency of the writ petition, subsequent developments have taken place, which rendered the matter infructuous. It is further contended that after cancellation of the petitioner's selection, a fresh advertisement was issued, pursuant to which respondent no. 7 came to be selected and appointed. Subsequently, the appointment of respondent no. 7 was also challenged before the appellate authority, which was set aside. The said order was thereafter challenged before the Divisional Commissioner, whereupon the Divisional Commissioner, while affirming the order of the appellate authority, directed that a fresh selection process be undertaken. It is also contended that, in compliance with the said direction, a fresh selection process has already been initiated.



5. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the respective parties and taking note of the subsequent developments brought on record, this Court is of the considered view that the controversy involved in the present writ petition has lost its practical significance. Since the petitioner's selection stood cancelled, a fresh advertisement was issued, a fresh selection was conducted, the said selection was also set aside, and a further selection process has already commenced pursuant to the orders passed by the competent authorities, no useful purpose would now be served by examining the legality of the impugned orders on merit(s).

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed as having become infructuous.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

U			
---	--	--	--

