

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.17790 of 2023**

=====

Manjula Devi wife of Sudhir Ram, resident of Village and Panchayat -  
Maheshua, Ward No. 11. P.S. - Triveniganj, District - Supaul.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Commissioner, Kohi Division, Saharsa.
3. The Collector - cum - District Magistrate, Supaul.
4. The District Programme officer, Supaul.
5. The Child Development Project officer, Triveniganj, District Supaul.
6. Parvati Kumari wife of Raj Deo Kumar Ram, resident of Village and Grampanchayat Maheshua, Ward No. 11, P.S. - Triveniganj, District - Supaul.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashwani Kumar Tiwary, Adv.  
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Subhash Prasad Singh ( GA-3 )

=====

**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 |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

