

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Letters Patent Appeal No.4 of 2025

In

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1826 of 2024

=====

Shabana Khatoon W/o Jawed Ansari, R/o Village-Sondhani, Post-Bhagwanpur, District-Siwan.

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat Building, Patna.
2. The Director, Integrated Child Development Scheme, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Bihar, New Secretariat Building, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Siwan.
4. The District Programme Officer, Siwan.
5. The District Welfare Officer, Siwan.
6. The Child Development Project Officer, Bhagwanpur Hatt, Block-Bhagwanpur Hatt, District-Siwan.
7. The Women Supervisor, Secretary of Selection Committee, Child Development Scheme, Bhagwanpur Hatt, Block-Bhagwanpur Hatt, District-Siwan.
8. Binita Gupta, Wife of Rajesh Kumar Gupta, R/o Village and Post-Bhagwanpur, District-Siwan.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s	:	Mr. Alok Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Pranav Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr. Vijay Bardhan Pandey, Advocate
	:	Ms. Ruchi Acharya, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Government Advocate (7)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and

HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date : 02-07-2026

We have heard learned counsel for the appellant,
who is impugning the order of the learned Single Judge in



C.W.J.C. No. 1826 of 2024, wherein vide order dated 29.02.2024, it was observed as follows :

“2. At the outset, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks not to press the present writ petition, however, seeks liberty on behalf of the petitioner to avail such other alternative remedies as are otherwise available under the law, including that of filing a suit before the learned Civil Court having competent jurisdiction for redressal of her aforesaid grievances. Liberty so sought is granted.

3. The writ petition stands dismissed as not pressed.”

2. Learned counsel for the State-respondents no. 1 to 7 and learned counsel for the private respondent no. 8 submit, that, the impugned order dismissing the writ petition was pronounced on submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner who sought not to press the writ petition. Thus, on this ground alone the instant L.P.A. is not even maintainable.

3. Having considered the submissions and the averments in the L.P.A, we are constrained to observe that, the petition was “dismissed as not pressed” on the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioner, as detailed in the Order extracted hereinabove, for convenient reference.

4. In light of the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner before the writ Court who sought not to press the writ petition and instead sought to avail of the



alternative remedies, available under law, the impugned order of the learned Single Judge cannot be faulted and thereby warrants no interference. The L.P.A is therefore not maintainable and is dismissed and disposed of accordingly.

(Meenakshi Madan Rai, CJ)

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

anand/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	06.07.2026
Transmission Date	NA

