

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13310 of 2022

=====

Priyanka Kumari @ Priyanka Devi W/o Alok Kumar Singh Resident of Tola-Chordihara, Village- Sarahula, P.O.- Harnathpur, P.S.- Mohania, Block-Mohania, District- Kaimur (Bhabhua).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme (ICDS), Department of Social Welfare, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Deputy Director, Department of Welfare, Patna Division, Patna, Bihar.
4. The District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
5. The District Programme Officer (ICDS), Kaimur at Bhabhua.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Block- Mohania (Kaimur).
7. The Chairman-cum-Ward Member, Sevika Sahayika Selection Committee, Anganwari Centre Code- 243, Ward No. 12, Gram Panchayat- Baghini, Block- Mohania, District- Kaimur.
8. The Vice-President-cum-Ward Panch, Sevika Sahayika Selection Committee, Ward No. 12, Anganwari Centre Code- 243, Gram Panchayat- Baghini, Block- Mohania, District- Kaimur.
9. The Secretary-cum-Mahila Supervisor, Sevika Sahayika Selection Committee, Ward No. 12, Anganwari Centre Code- 243, Gram Panchayat- Baghini, Block- Mohania, District- Kaimur.
10. The Selection Committee, Ward No. 12, Anganwari Centre Code- 243, Gram Panchayat- Baghini, Block- Mohania, District- Kaimur.
11. The Mahila Supervisor, the Child Development Project Officer, Block-Mohania, District- Kaimur.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Saroj Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prashant Pratap (GP-2)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 13-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the



following relief/s:-

“I. To issue an appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of writ of Certiorari for quashing the inquiry report made by the Three Men Committee dated 21.05.2022 by which the Committee had hold that an inspection of Village- Chordihra and Village- Sarhula which comes under the purview of Ward No. 12 & 11 respectively and the Committee found that the Village Sarhula comes under the purview of Ward No. 11 where the Anganwari Sevika Priyanka Devi is residing. It is stated that two wards, Ward No. 11 & 12 is together made of Village Chaudihra & Sarhula (in short full voters of village Choradihara + some voters of village Sarahula = ward no 12, And only Some voters of village Sarahula = ward no.11) i.e. Various persons of Village Sarhula belong to Ward No. 11 & 12. Even the person who belongs to Ward No. 12 and his father belongs to Ward No. 11 and as such it cannot be said that the Ward No. 11 & 12 are separate wards and as such the candidate of Anganwari Sevika of Ward No. 12 can be made candidate of village



Sarahula and ward no.11.

II. To issue an appropriate writ/order/direction in the nature of writ of Mandamus directing the respondents to let continue the petitioner as Anganwari Sevika of Village Sarahula, Panchayat Bagani, Distict- Kaimur of Ward No. 12 as the petitioner is permanent resident of Ward No. 12, Village Sarahula and various persons of Village Sarahula are resident of Ward No. 12 as well Ward No. 11. Since the year 2015, the petitioner is also a voter of the same ward which is at serial no. 308. Since the year 2019, the petitioner is a Anganwari Sevika and continued on that post but now in the inquiry report they have hold that Ward No. 11 & 12 are different and have been made of two different villages separately, which is actually not correct. But being relied upon the report of three members committee the Hon'ble Court rejected the prayer of the petitioner prayed in CWJC no 23937/2019 and ignored the facts mentioned in different paragraphs by only providing liberty to assail the findings of the three members committee in accordance with law.

III. To any other relief or reliefs for



which the petitioner is found to be entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. After some argument, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw this writ petition to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

4. Permission is granted.

5. As such, the present writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

