

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7614 of 2025

=====

Tabassum Pravin wife of Md. Kaisar Ali, resident of village Simra, keshopur,
P.S.- Sakra, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal secretary, Social Welfare department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Department of Integrated Child Development, Bihar, Patna.
3. The secretary Department of Integrated Child Development, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Collector cum District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
5. The District program officer, Department of Integrated Child Development, Muzaffarpur.
6. The District Welfare officer, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Child development project officer, Sakra, Muzaffarpur.
8. The Supervisor, Child development project officer, Sakra, Muzaffarpur
9. Sabra Khatoon wife of Ahmad Hussain resident of village -Keshopur, ward no.- 12, village Keshopur, P.S.- Sakra, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Yugal Kishore, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Government Pleader (19)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

3 06-04-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and
learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for
quashing the order dated 04.11.2024 (Annexure-5 to the writ
petition) passed by respondent no. 4, namely, the Collector-cum-



District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur, as well as the order dated 16.07.2022 (Annexure P-4 to the writ petition) passed by respondent no. 5 in Case No. 59 of 2021. The petitioner has also prayed for reinstatement to her post.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order passed by the Collector is wholly illegal and not in accordance with law. It is further submitted that although the petitioner is shown to be in two different services with two different dates of birth, she has used only one date of birth, and therefore, no illegality can be attributed to her.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State submits that there is no illegality in the impugned orders. It is contended that the District Programme Officer has recorded a categorical finding after due consideration of the materials on record, and the appellate authority, upon proper appreciation of the same, has affirmed the said order finding no infirmity therein.

5. Upon perusal of the order passed by the District Programme Officer as well as the District Magistrate, it is evident that the difference between the age of the alleged mother and son is only 8 years, 8 months, and 11 days, which is an impossibility.



6. In view of the aforesaid facts and findings, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the present writ petition.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Ashwini/-

U			
---	--	--	--

