



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA, AT DHARWAD

DATED THIS THE 16TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S G PANDIT

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE GEETHA K.B.

WRIT APPEAL NO.100749 OF 2025 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SHRUTI RAJPUT S
AGE. 32 YEARS, OCC. HOUSE WIFE,
R/O. NEAR AMBEDKAR SCHOOL,
MARUTI NAGAR, DANDELI (RURAL), DANDELI,
TAL. HALIYAL, DIST. UTTAR KANNDA-581325.

...APPELLANT

(BY SRI. PRASHANTH MATHAPATI, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
BY ITS SECRETARY TO THE WOMEN,
AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
M.S. BUILDING, BENGALURU-560001.
2. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
KARWAR-581329.
3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT OFFICE,
WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
HALIYAL-581329.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. SHARAD V. MAGADUM, AGA FOR R1 TO R3)

THIS WRIT APPEAL IS FILED UNDER SEC.4 OF KARNATAKA HIGH COURT ACT, 1961, PRAYING TO SET ASIDE THE ORDER PASSED BY THE LEARNED SINGLE JUDGE IN WRIT PETITION NO.104081 OF 2025 DATED 29-10-2025, RESTORE THE WRIT PETITION AND PERMIT THE APPELLANT TO PROCEED THE PETITION BY ALLOWING THE PRESENT WRIT APPEAL IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE AND EQUITY.



THIS WRIT APPEAL COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING,
THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S G PANDIT
AND
THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE GEETHA K.B.

ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S G PANDIT)

The unsuccessful petitioner is before this Court in this intra-Court appeal filed under Section 4 of the Karnataka High Court Act, 1961, questioning the order dated 29.10.2025 passed in WP No.104081/2025, whereunder, the petitioner's prayer to consider her representation to declare and publish final select list of Anganwadi Helper in respect of Ward No.7, Maruti Nagar-2, Dandeli, is rejected.

2. Heard learned counsel Sri.Prashant Mathapati for the appellant and learned AGA Sri. Sharad V Magadam for respondents No.1 to 3. Perused the entire writ appeal papers.

3. It is stated that the petitioner and others applied for the post of Anganwadi Helper for Ward No.7, Maruti Nagar-2, Dandeli. It is further stated that the name of the petitioner appeared in the select list (Annexure-C) at Sl.No.25. However, it is the grievance of the petitioner that the select list insofar



as Maruti Nagar-2 is cancelled without any reason. Subsequent representation of the petitioner was rejected under endorsement dated 20.05.2025 (Annexure-D) stating that the petitioner had applied for the post of Anganwadi Helper in respect of Ward No.7, Maruti Nagar-2 and not in respect of Ward No.6, Maruti Nagar-1. It is also stated that for application to the post of Anganwadi Helper at Ward No.7, the petitioner applied enclosing the Residential Certificate of Ward No.6. Thus, the respondents rejected the application of the petitioner on the ground that she had not applied for Ward No.6. Questioning the said endorsement, the petitioner was before this Court in the above stated writ petition. The learned Single Judge under impugned order dated 29.10.2025 rejected the writ petition, holding that the candidate whose name figures in the select list would not get any right to question the selection or seek a mandamus that the selection should be taken to its logical conclusion.

4. Learned counsel Sri. Prashanth Mathapati for the appellant/petitioner would submit that, on behalf of the



respondents/State, submission was made that the selection process itself is shelved and a new notification is issued calling for applications from the eligible candidates.

5. It is stated that there is no new notification issued, as submitted by the learned AGA. Taking note of the said submission, we had asked the learned AGA to file an affidavit of responsible person of the respondents/State. Accordingly, an Affidavit of one Siddalingappa Korawar, Child Development Project Officer, Joida (in-charge Haliyal), Uttara Kannada District, is filed stating that the submission that new notification is issued calling for application from the eligible candidates was made inadvertently. Further, at paragraph-5 of the affidavit, it is stated that notification calling for applications for the post of Anganwadi Helper for Ward No.6, Maruti Nagar-2, Dandeli City has not been issued, because Dandeli City is shown as a single revenue ward. Therefore, it is stated that request has been made to divide it into separate wards, which is under consideration. It is submitted that immediately on publishing separate ward, Department would



take action to issue notification calling for applications from the eligible candidates for the post of Anganwadi Helper for Ward No.6, Maruti Nagar-2, Dandeli.

6. Learned AGA Sri. Sharad V Magadum for the respondents/State would submit that the petitioner has no right to seek appointment, though her name appears in the select list. It is specifically contended by the learned AGA that no person is appointed as Anganwadi Helper for Ward No.6, Maruti Nagar-2, as such, there is no cause of action for the appellant/petitioner to approach this Court. Thus, he would pray for dismissal of the writ appeal.

7. On hearing the learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the entire writ appeal papers, we are not inclined to interfere with the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

8. With regard to submission that new notification is issued calling for applications from the eligible candidates, it is explained in the affidavit dated 11.12.2025 stating that the said submission was made inadvertently and calling for applications from the eligible candidates, notification would be



issued soon after separate ward number is given. As held by the learned Single Judge, no candidate in the select list has right to seek employment. Only when the candidate below the petitioner is appointed, cause of action to seek employment based on the selection list would arise. It is well settled position of law that mere inclusion of candidates' name in the select list would not give any right to such candidate to seek a writ of mandamus for appointment. Thus, we do not find any error or illegality to interfere with the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge. Accordingly, writ appeal stands ***rejected***.

Pending applications, if any, are disposed of as not surviving for consideration.

**Sd/-
(S G PANDIT)
JUDGE**

**Sd/-
(GEETHA K.B.)
JUDGE**