

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1785 of 2022**

---

---

Neha Kumari Wife of Sri Uday Kumar Resident of Village- Chamanpura,  
P.S.- Baikunthpur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. Director, I.C.D.S. Social Welfare Department, Bihar, Patna
3. The Collector, Gopalganj.
4. District Programe Officer, Gopalganj.
5. Child Development Project Officer, Baikunthpur Block, District Gopalganj.
6. Ravita Kumari Wife of Sri Arvind Kumar Resident of Village- Chamanpura, P.S.- Baikunthpur, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Respondent/s

---

---

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Naresh Chandra Verma, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : Smt. Kumari Amrita (GP-3)

---

---

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 20-01-2026**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for quashing of the order dated 08.07.2021 passed by the Collector, Gopalganj in Anganbari Appeal Case No. 23 of 2018 (Annexure-4).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the vacancy was notified for appointment of Anganbari Sevika for Centre No. 220, Chamanpura, Yadavtola, under Chamanpura Panchayat of Baikunthpur Block of Gopalganj District. Counsel



submits that on the basis of marks obtained in the High School Examination 2014 from Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad, Uttar Pradesh, petitioner was having requisite qualification. In the *Aam Sabha*, the name of the petitioner was considered in the merit list in which her name was figured at Sr. No.1. Counsel further submits that the petitioner was selected for the post of Anganbari Sevika and she joined the post and working as Anganbari Sevika at Chamanpura Centre No. 220. Counsel submits that after selection of the petitioner, private respondent no.6 filed Anganbari Appeal Case No. 69 of 2018 before the District Programme Officer, Gopalganj stating therein that the petitioner has passed matriculation examination from Bihar School Examination Board, Patna in 2<sup>nd</sup> Division and she had only 46.2% marks, whereas, the private respondent no.6 had 67.4% marks in matriculation examination, and therefore, she should be selected in place of the petitioner. Counsel further submits that before the D.P.O, Gopalganj, contest took place and the said Anganbari Appeal Case No. 69 of 2018 was rejected on 22.05.2018. Thereafter, the private respondent no.6 preferred 2<sup>nd</sup> appeal bearing Anganbari Appeal Case No. 23 of 2018 before the Collector, Gopalganj, in which final order has been passed on 08.07.2021 and the said Anganbari Appeal Case No. 23 of



2018 was allowed in favour of the private respondent no.6. Counsel further submits that the case of the petitioner has not been considered at all and it is his case that the petitioner passed her matriculation from Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad in the year 2014 and marks obtained in the Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad, U.P is the basis for appointment of the petitioner on the post of Anganbari Sevika. But, instead thereof, the Collector, Gopalganj has not considered the case of the petitioner and instead thereof, the forgery done at the instance of respondent no.6 has been taken into consideration. Therefore, he submits that interference is required from this Hon'ble Court in the order passed by the Collector, Gopalganj dated 08.07.2021 in Anganbari Appeal Case No. 23 of 2018.

4. Learned counsel for the State on the other hand submits that the order passed by the Collector, Gopalganj is absolutely in accordance with law as the mark sheet provided by the petitioner was verified from the Bihar School Examination Board and thereafter, the decision for removal of the petitioner has taken place. He submits that in the operative part of the order, the Collector has categorically indicated the complete circumstance in which the decision against the petitioner has taken place.



5. After hearing the parties, one document is very much relevant i.e. *Medha Suchi* which was published for selection and indicates that the petitioner has produced the mark sheet of Bihar School Examination Board. But, even after this publication of *Medha Suchi*, the petitioner has not raised any objection that she has appeared in the selection by virtue of her marks from the Madhyamik Shiksha Parishad, U.P. The selection was completed and she joined and only thereafter, this question has been raised. It is due to this reason that once the said *Medha Suchi* was wrong then the petitioner ought to raise this point at the earliest.

6. As such, this Court finds that there is no merit in this case and hence, this writ petition stands dismissed.

**(Dr. Anshuman, J)**

Divyansh/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	22/01/2026
Transmission Date	NA

