

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8045 of 2026

Radha Kumari wife of Janesh Kumar, resident of village Loharwa Bigha, P.S.
Hilsa, District Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary Social Welfare Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director I.C.D.S, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Commissioner, Patna Division, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Nalanda.
5. The Additional Collector Cum Additional District Magistrate, Nalanda.
6. The District Programme Officer, Nalanda at Biharsharif.
7. The Child Development Project officer Hilsa, District Nalanda.
8. Vibha Kumari wife of Nitish Kumar, resident of Village khorampur, P.S. Hilsa, District Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Lovekush Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Rakesh Prabhat, AC to SC-21

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 22-06-2026

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

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has filed the
present writ petition with the following reliefs:

*(a) For grant of an appropriate
writ for quashing the order dated 21.08.2025
passed by the Divisional Commissioner
Patna in I.C.D.S Case No. 55/2025*



dismissing the revision petition filed by the petitioner.

(b) For grant of an appropriate writ for quashing the order dated 31.12.2024 passed by the learned Additional Collector Cum Additional District Magistrate, Nalanda in Anganwadi Appeal No. 02/2023 dismissing the Appeal filed by the petitioner.

(c) For grant of an appropriate writ for quashing the order dated 31.12.2015 passed by the learned District Programme officer Nalanda under Memo No. 2670/Pro.

(d) For grant of an appropriate writ for quashing the appointment/selection letter dated 20.01.2016 under memo No. 36 issued by Child Development Project Officer, Hilsa (Nalanda) in favour of the respondent No. 8 Vibha Kumari.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that petitioner has earlier moved before this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 18604 of 2015, dated 30.01.2023, in which it has been categorically observed by this Hon'ble Court that appointment of Anganwadi worker can be raised before the Collector of the concerned district with a further revision before the Commissioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner in the light of the observation made by this Hon'ble Court has moved before the Collector and, thereafter



the matter went for revision to the Commissioner. Counsel submits that but the Commissioner failed to entertain the revision application and, therefore, he filed the present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel of the state, on the other hand, submits that it is true that petitioner has moved earlier before this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 18604 of 2015. In para-3, the observation was made by this Hon'ble Court that grievance of appointment of Aanganwadi Worker can be raised before the Collector of the concerned district with a further revision to the Commissioner, but he submits that further in para-4 this Hon'ble Court has categorically observed with regard to the petitioner that the order passed by the Collector or Commissioner would not be the subject matter of judicial review and also directed that the writ petition would not be maintainable even after orders of the Collector or Commissioner. Therefore, he submits that in the light of the observation made by the single Bench on which the petitioner is relying, there is no scope of judicial review for the petitioner and according to him the writ petition be dismissed.

5. After hearing the parties, it transpires to this Court that both petitioner and respondent relied on the judgment



passed by this Hon'ble Court with regard to the petitioner vide order dated 30.01.2023 passed in C.W.J.C. No. 18604 of 2015, particularly, observations made in paragraphs 4 to 7, which stated as follows:

“4. Even the orders passed by the Collector or the Commissioner would not be a subject matter of judicial review as the power being exercised by them relating to a dispute of Anganwadi Worker is under guidelines and they do not act as a statutory authority while deciding such dispute. In view thereof, the writ petition would not be maintainable even against the orders of the Collector or the Commissioner.

5. Leaving it open to the respective writ petition to avail any of the aforesaid remedies, if they have not so availed, the writ petition is held to be not maintainable.

6. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

7. If an appeal/revision is filed, the same shall be decided expeditiously within a period of six months and the question of limitation will not arise.”

6. This order has been passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court particularly with regard to the petitioner. Since the petitioner did not challenge that order before a



higher court, the order has become final and binding upon him.

In that earlier order, the Court had held that a writ petition against the orders of the Collector or Commissioner is not maintainable. Therefore, this Court is bound by that earlier decision and cannot take a different view. Consequently, the present writ petition is dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./Rakesh/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

