



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 1ST DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI

WRIT PETITION NO. 21661 OF 2021 (S-RES)

BETWEEN:

SMT. RANJITHA B.P.,
W/O RAJANAIAK,
AGED ABOUT 21 YEARS,
RESIDENT OF HALEKALLNAYAKANAHALLI,
JAJUR POST, ARSIKERE TALUK,
HASSAN DISTRICT - 573 103.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI.B.V.MOHAN ADEKAR, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
REPRESENTED BY ITS
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT,
M.S.BUILDING,
BANGALORE - 1.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
HASSAN,
HASSAN DISTRICT - 573 201.
3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT,

Digitally
signed by
SUNITHA K
S
Location:
HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA





3RD CROSS, K.R.PURAM,
HASSAN - 573 201.

4. CHILD DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
OFFICE OF THE WOMEN AND
CHILD DEVELOPMENT,
ARSIKERE,
HASSAN DISTRICT - 573 201.
5. SMT. NEERAJA K.M.,
W/O RAVINAIK,
W/O SHEKARAPPA,
MAJOR,
RESIDENT OF HALEKALLANAYAKANAHALLI,
JAJURU POST, ARSIKERE TALUK,
HASSAN DISTRICT - 577 200.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.G.RAMESH NAIK, AGA FOR R1 TO R3;
SRI.JAGADEESH H.T., ADVOCATE FOR R5;
R4 SERVED)

THIS WP IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA PRAYING TO QUASH THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE R3 DATED 30.06.2021 VIDE
ANNEXURE-K IN SO FAR AS REJECTION OF THE APPLICATION
OF THE PETITIONER FOR SELECTION TO THE POST OF
ANGANAWADI WORKER AT HALEKALLANAYAKANAHALLI
ANGANAWADI CENTRE, ARSIKERE TALUK, HASSAN DISTRICT
AND ETC.,



THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING
IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS
UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK S.KINAGI

ORAL ORDER

1. The petitioner filed this petition seeking the following prayer:
 - i) Issue a writ in the nature of certiorari to quash the proceedings of the 3rd respondent dated 30.06.2021 vide Annexure-K insofar as rejection of the application of the petitioner for selection to the post of Anganawadi worker at Halekallanayakanahalli Anganawadi centre, Arsikere taluk, Hassan district and etc.,
 - ii) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents 2 and 4 to consider the representation dated 10.09.2020 and 23.03.2021 vide Annexure-H and J and to pass orders thereon;
 - iii) Alternatively, direct the respondents 2 to 4 to select and appoint the petitioner to the post of Anganawadi worker, Halekallanayakanahalli



Anganawadi Centre, Arsikere Taluk, Hassan District.

2. Brief facts leading rise to the filing of this petition are as follows:
3. On 06.06.2020, respondent No.4 issued notification inviting applications for the post of Anganawadi worker at Halekallanayakanahalli village, Arsikere Taluk, Hassan District. The petitioner applied for the post of Anganwadi worker. The respondent No.4, after scrutinizing the documents produced by the candidates published the provisional selection list on 07.09.2020 and in the said provisional list one Smt. Ranjithabai was selected to the Halekallanayakanahalli Anganwadi Center, Halekallnayakanahalli Village, Arsikere Talu, Hassan District.
4. The petitioner filed objections to the provisional selection list published by respondent No.4, stating that, she has created some bogus documents to



obtain job and she is not residing in the vicinity of Halekallnayakanahalli Village. The respondents have failed to consider the objections submitted by the petitioner. On 23.03.2021, the petitioner submitted one more objection to respondent No.2 stating that appointment of the petitioner is not in accordance with the notification. In spite of objection submitted by the petitioner, the respondent No.4 published final selection list without considering the objection and respondent No.5 was appointed as an Anganwadi worker. It is contended that the petitioner is more meritorious than respondent No.5. The respondents rejected the application of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner is not the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli Village. Hence, prays to allow the petition.

5. The respondent No.5 filed statement of objections admitting that the notification published inviting applications for the post of Anganwadi worker and



the candidate should be resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village. Further, there is no dispute regarding the petitioner and respondent No.5 have applied for the said post. It is contended that the petitioner was not the resident of the said village as on the date of issuing a notification. Hence, the petitioner is not eligible for the said post. It is also contended that as per the notification itself it is made clear that the candidate who is the resident of the said village is eligible for the Anganwadi worker. The petitioner was not the resident of the said village as on the date of issuing notification. Respondent No.5 was the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village and she was selected and appointed as Anganwadi worker. The action of respondent No.4 in appointing respondent No.5 is in accordance with the notification. Hence, prays to dismiss the writ petition.



6. Heard the arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Advocate for the respondents.
7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village as on the date of notification and the petitioner has produced the residential certificate issued by the Tahsildar. He also submits that the petitioner has scored higher marks than respondent No.5. He submits that respondent No.5 is not eligible for the said post. Hence, the appointment of respondent No.5 is arbitrary and erroneous. Hence, on these grounds, prays to allow the writ petition.
8. *Per contra*, learned Government Advocate submits that the petitioner married on 12.06.2020. The husband of the petitioner is the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli Tandy and as on the date of notification, the petitioner was not the resident of the said village and he also placed a reliance on the



notification which discloses that the candidate should be a resident of the said village one year prior to the date of issuance of the notification. He submits that the petitioner was not the resident of the said village one year prior to the issuance of notification. Respondent No.4 has rightly rejected the application of the petitioner. He also submits that respondent No.4 considering the objections filed by the petitioner has selected the respondent No. 5 as she was eligible for the said post. Hence, the action of the respondent No.4 in appointing the respondent No.5 is in accordance with law. Hence, on these grounds, she prays to dismiss the writ petition.

9. Perused the records, and considered the submissions of the learned counsel to the parties.
10. It is an undisputed fact that respondent No. 4 issued notification inviting the applications for the post of Anganwadi worker, Halekallnayakanahalli village vide notification dated 06.06.2020. The petitioner and



respondent No.5 applied for the said post. As per the notification, the candidate should be a resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village prior to one year from the date of issuance of notification. Admittedly, the petitioner got married to Rajanaik who was the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village on 12.06.2020 i.e., after issuing notification dated 06.06.2020.

11. Admittedly, the petitioner was not the resident of the said Halekallnayakanahalli village as on the date of issuance of notification. The Tahsildar has issued a residential Certificate to the petitioner stating that the petitioner is the resident of Halekallnayakanahalli village. Immediately the respondent No.4 sought for a report from the Tahsildar, wherein the Tahsildar has submitted a report dated 14.10.2020, stating that the petitioner was residing in the said village only after the marriage and not one year prior to the issuance of a notification. As the petitioner is not



eligible for the post of Anganwadi worker, she is not a resident of the said village prior to one year from the date of issuing the notification, the respondent No.4 has rightly rejected the application of the petitioner.

12. The petitioner contended that respondent No.5 is not the resident of the said village and she is not eligible for the post of Anganwadi worker and the petitioner has scored more marks than respondent No.5 and she has filed the objection to the provisional list. Respondent No.4 considering the objections submitted by the petitioner has selected the respondent No.5. The action of respondent No. 4 in selecting respondent No. 5 is legal and in accordance with law. Hence, I do not find any error in the appointment of respondent No.5 as Anganwadi worker of Halekallnayakanahalli village.



13. Accordingly, I proceed to pass the following order:

ORDER

The writ petition is ***dismissed***.

Pending interlocutory application/s, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

**Sd/-
(ASHOK S.KINAGI)
JUDGE**

SKS