

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10959 of 2026

Angu Kumari Wife of Ramjee Yadav, resident of village- Kaithi Tola Shiva
Bigha Panchayat Chabura Block- Konch Ward No. 12, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Services, Bihar.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, Magadh Division, Gayaji.
4. The District Magistrate, Gayaji.
5. The District Programme Officer, Gayaji.
6. The Child Development Programme officer Block- Konch, District- Gayaji.
7. Lady Supervisor Anchal and Block- Konch, District- Gayaji.
8. Smt. Priyanka Sinha @ Priyanka Kumari, Wife of Arjun Jay Kumar, resident of village- Kaithi Tola Shiva Bigha, Panchayat- Chabura, Block- Konch, Ward No.- 12, P.O. and P.S.- Konch, District- Gayaji.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Government Advocate (5)

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL ORDER

2 27-07-2026 Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned
Counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition admittedly arises out of
the Aganwari matter.

3. Learned Counsel for the State submits that the issue



involved in the present writ petition is covered by the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in L.P.A. No. 695 of 2023 (Ram Dulari Devi Vs The State of Bihar and Others) decided on 09.04.2026.

4. Having considered the rival submissions on behalf of the parties and upon perusal of the aforesaid judgment, this Court feels it necessary to quote relevant paragraphs 15 to 19 of the aforesaid judgement as under :

“15. In view of the aforesaid settled principles, this Court is of the considered opinion that the writ petition itself was not maintainable, as the dispute pertains to engagement under a government scheme and does not involve violation of any statutory provision or enforceable legal right.

16. This Court, therefore, finds that the learned Single Judge has correctly appreciated the legal position and has rightly declined to exercise writ jurisdiction, leaving it open for the appellant to avail alternative remedies, if so advised.

17. Since the writ petition itself was not maintainable, this Court does not deem it appropriate to enter into the merits of the rival claims with respect to eligibility, residence, or alleged irregularities in the selection process.

18. In view of the discussions made hereinabove, no ground for interference is made out in exercise of intra-court appellate jurisdiction.

19. Accordingly, the present intra court appeal stands dismissed.”



5. In view of the finding made above by Hon'ble the Division of this Court, the present writ petition is not maintainable.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Manshi/Ashwini

U			
---	--	--	--

