

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 5311 of 2009**

Smt. Sadhna Rajwade, age 23 years, W/o Shri Rajendra Prasad by Post Sah - Sahayika R/o village Patrapali, Braj Nagar Block Surajpur, Tahsil Surajpur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Petitioner****Versu s**

- 1.State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat Evam Gramin Vikas Vibhag, DKS Mantralaya Bhavan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 2.The Director, Panchayat, DKS Mantralaya Bhavan, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
- 3.The Collector/Additional Collector, District Ambikapur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.
- 4.The Chief Executive Officer, Mahila Evam Bal Vikas Vibhag, Women and Child Development Department, Janpad Surajpur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.
- 5.Smt. Lalman, age 30 years, W/o Harishankar R/o village Braj Nagar, Block Surajpur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.
- 6.Smt. Shivkumari @ Sunita Age 28 years, W/o Rambhajan and D/o Radhika Prasad, R/o village Braj Nagar, Block Surajpur, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioner	:	Shri S.A.Ansari, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Shri B. Gopa Kumar, Deputy Advocate General.
For Respondent No. 5	:	Shri D.N.Prajapate, Advocate.
For Respondent No. 6	:	Shri Shrawan Agrawal, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Navin Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****16/10/2015**

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the Respondents.
2. The Petitioner assails the order dated 21.7.2009 passed by the Director, Panchayat, Chhattisgarh in Case No. 209/A-89/2008-09 declining to interfere with the order of the Collector dated 14.6.2007 in turn rejecting the challenge to the appointment of the private Respondents on the post of Anganbadi Karyakarta.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that according to the Government policy, preference was to be given to an Anganbadi Sahayika in appointment of Anganbadi Karyakarta. The Petitioner was an Anganbadi Sahayika and the Respondents were not, yet they were granted appointment ignoring the candidature of the Petitioner.

4. The impugned order notices that the Collector rejected the challenge made by the Petitioner on 14.6.2007 after which the revision before the Director was filed on 19.1.2009 who rejected it opining that delay of approximately 19 months was crucial and there was no occasion to interfere with the same. In any matter related to appointment, whether it be an appointment of a government servant or agent of the government, if third party rights have accrued and delay is not explained, the claim becomes stale and cannot be entertained as it would essentially be giving an advantage to a person not vigilant for protection of her own rights to destabilise matters which had attained stability.

5. The writ petition is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE