

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W. P. (S) No. 2718 of 2015**

Supriti Devi Petitioner
Versus
1. State of Jharkhand.
2. Deputy Commissioner, Chatra.
3. Deputy Development Commissioner, Chatra.
4. District Welfare Officer, Chatra
5. Child Development Project officer, Chatra..... Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH

For the Petitioner : Mr. Chandrajit Mukherjee, Adv.
For the Respondents : J. C. to A.A.G.

4/31.08.2015 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

Petitioner has approached this Court in June, 2015, seeking a direction upon the respondents for approval of provisional selection as Sevika on the basis of Aam Sabha said to have been held on 26th August, 2009 for the appointment of Sevika for Marangkala Aaganbari Center. The provisional selection letter issued by Child Development Project Officer, Chatra dated 26th August, 2009 is Annexure-1. Petitioner has enclosed a document at Annexure-2 said to be the proceeding of Aam Sabha held on 26th August, 2009 in support of her contention.

Perusal of Annexure-2 shows that it is incomplete and does not bear attendance of any villager in the selection process or all the official representatives who form part of the such selection process. It however appears to have been signed by Mahila Supervisor and the District Welfare Officer -cum-Chairman. This is not a complete document which could enable the Court to come to a conclusion whether the selection itself was done in terms of the Department of Social Welfare, Woman and Child, circular dated 2nd June, 2006, which lays down the guidelines in the matter of selection to such Sevika/Sahayika of any center. Petitioner's representation at Annexure-3 dated 23rd May, 2014 shows that repeated selection exercise have been held for appointment of Sevika of the said centre, such as, on 13th May, 2010; 31st March, 2012 and 27th December, 2013. None of the proceedings of Aam Sabha have been brought on

record. Petitioner after six years of her provisional selection in June, 2009 has approached this Court without enclosing any documents of intervening developments taken during these years. These material facts and supporting documents being absent in the writ petition no determination of the claim of the petitioner can be made in exercise of the writ jurisdiction where petitioner is expected to come clean before the Court. Therefore, this Court in exercise of its writ jurisdiction is not inclined to entertain this writ application. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

(Aparesh Kumar Singh,J)

jk