

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 4361 of 2010**

Pushpa Verma D/o Bhanuram Verma, aged about 35 years, R/o village Aursi,  
Tahsil Palari, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through Secretary, Women and Child Welfare Department, DKS Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Director, Women & Child Welfare Department, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector, Women and Child Welfare Department, Raipur District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Project Officer, Unified Child Development Project, Palari, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Palari, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Respondents**


---

|                      |   |                                  |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner       | : | Shri Manoj Paranjpe, Advocate.   |
| For Respondent/State | : | Shri Vivek Sharma, Panel Lawyer. |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice****Order on Board****09/10/2015**

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the State.
2. The challenge in this writ application is to the denial by the Respondents to consider the Petitioner for appointment on the post of Anganbadi Supervisor under an advertisement published in January-February 2009.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that if she had completed 10 years of service as Anganbadi worker, she fulfilled the conditions of the advertisement and if she had resigned thereafter, she could not have been denied consideration on the ground that she was no more working when there was no such condition stipulated in the advertisement.

4. Learned Counsel for the State submits that apart from the same, the post has not remained vacant and another has been appointed. Any direction given for consideration with regard to the Petitioner would obviously be at the cost of another and there is no challenge to the subsequent appointment.

5. Considering that the selection process is over, the post is not vacant and another has been appointed as mentioned in the counter affidavit by the Respondents and in absence of any challenge to the same by the Petitioner, it is difficult to consider the grievance of the Petitioner any further.

6. The writ application is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Navin Sinha)  
**CHIEF JUSTICE**