

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18447 of 2023

=====

Zubaida Khatoon @ Juvida Khatton @ Jubida Khatoon Wife of Md. Firoz Alam, Resident of Village-Majhaura (Ward No. 11) P.S.-Laukaha, District-Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director, I.C.D.S. Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector of the District Madhubani
4. The District Programme Officer, Madhubani, District-Madhubani.
5. The Mahila Supervisor, Laukaha (Khutauna), P.S. Laukaha, District-Madhubani.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Khutauna, District-Madhubani.
7. Mehnaj Begum, wife of Md. Nasim, Resident of Village-Majhaura, Ward No. 11, Block-Khutauna, P.S.-Laukaha, District-Madhubani.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Md. Anisur Rahman, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar (GP-24)

=====

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			
---	--	--	--

