

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.10990 of 2026

=====

Kumari Indu W/o Sri Ram Sumiran Rai @ Ramsumran Ray Resident of
Village - Ward No. 13, Jhamatiya, Bhagwanpur, P.s. Bacchwara, District-
Begusarai, Bihar 851111.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Chief Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director, Integrated Child Development Services Directorate (ICDS), Social Welfare Department, 2nd Floor, Indira Bhawan, Ramcharitra Singh Road, Patna.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Munger.
5. The District Magistrate, Begusarai.
6. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Begusarai.
7. The District Programme Officer, Begusarai.
8. The District Public Grievance Redressal Officer, Begusarai.
9. The Child Development Project Officer, Birpur, District- Begusarai.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajnish Prakash, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Additional Advocate General (4)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 28-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
present writ petition admittedly arises out of *Anganbari* matter.

3. Learned counsel for the State raised preliminary
objection and 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 ***Letters Patent Appeal No. 695 of 2023 (Ram Dulari Devi Vs. The State of Bihar and Ors.)*** 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 deems it necessary to quote the relevant para nos. 15 to 19 of the aforesaid judgment which states 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. As such, in the light of order passed by the Hon’ble Division Bench of this Court as mentioned above, this Court finds that this writ petition is not maintainable.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

