

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2103 of 2015**

- Ku. Jyotshana Kashyap, D/o Chandrika Prasad Kashyap, age around 26 years, presently posted as Female Multi-purpose Health Worker/ANM, at Community Centre Pali, Block Pali District Korba, R/o Village Gadvad, Post Gadvad, PS. Pali District Korba (C.G.)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Department of Health & Family Welfare, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Collector, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)
3. The Chief Medical & Health Officer, Korba, District Korba (C.G.)
4. The Block Medical Officer, Block Pali, District Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri Mateen Siddiqui, Advocate
For Respondents/State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****18/06/2015**

1. Petitioner is working as Multipurpose Health Worker (Female). By the impugned order dated 5-5-2015, she has been posted on execution of rationalization policy, from Community Health Centre, Pali to Sub Health Centre, Jemra.
2. Shri Siddiqui, learned counsel for the petitioner would draw attention of the Court to the rationalization policy to argue that in the said policy a Primary or

Sub Health Centre should have at least one health worker, therefore, since a male health worker is already posted at the place where the petitioner is now posted by the impugned order, there is violation of the rationalization policy.

3. The policy of rationalization has been evolved for proper distribution of health workers in all the Primary, Community and Sub Health Centres, depending upon the volume of work available. The exercise is purely administrative in nature and this Court while exercising power of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot sit as an appellate Court over the exercise undertaken by the administrative authorities. Even otherwise, the order of posting is within the same block and not at a far away place.
4. There is no substance in the writ petition, it fails and is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

JUDGE

ashu