

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 1017 of 2015**

- Rukmani Devi Chaturvedi W/o Shri Kailash Singh Chaturvedi Aged About 39 years R/o Village- Jhalri, Post- Akhrar, Tehsil- Lormi, P.S. Lormi, Revenue District Mungeli, (CG)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Health & Family Planning, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, New Raipur, District Raipur, (CG)
2. The Director, Director Of Health Services, 3rd Floor, Block-1, Indravati Bhavan, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, (CG)
3. The Chief Medical Officer, Mungeli, District Mungeli, (CG)
4. The Collector, Lormi, District Mungeli, (CG)
5. Smt. Shashi Dhritlehre W/o Shri Rajkumar Dhritlehre Aged About 33 Years R/o Village Nawagaon Ghuthera, Post & District Mungeli, (CG)
6. Pushpa Devi Joshi W/o Shri Maheshwar Singh Joshi Aged About 31 Years R/o Village- Pithampur, Post Dhangaon, District Mungeli, (CG)
7. Jayanti Rathore W/o Shri Parmanand Rahtore Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Bicharpur, Post Sukli, Tehsil Lormi, District Mungeli, (CG)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Anand Shukla, Advocate.
 For Respondent/State : Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****16/07/2015**

1. The petitioner has preferred this writ petition for a direction to the respondent authorities to send her for training of Auxiliary Nursing and Midwifery Course (ANM Course). She is also seeking quashment of the select list (Annexure-P/1).

2. It is urged that the petitioner is fully qualified and eligible for the post of ANM and has secured more marks than the private respondents, yet she has not been sent for training only on account of the fact that in the 12th class certificate, her name is mentioned as "Rukhamani" whereas in the 10th class certificate, her name is mentioned as "Rukmoni". Referring to para-4 of the return, Shri Shukla, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been denied admission in the said training course on the ground that at the time of counseling the petitioner failed to produce original mark-sheet of class-10th. However, the petitioner was always ready and willing to submit original mark sheet, but opportunity was not provided to her.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents would submit that in all material certificates produced by the petitioner, her name is differently mentioned, therefore, there is doubt about the genuineness of the certificates viz. a viz. the petitioner, therefore, she has rightly been denied admission in the ANM course.
4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and going by nature of dispute, this Court is not in a position to conclude as to what is the exact spelling of the petitioner's name because spelling of her name is mentioned in different manner in class-10th and class-12th certificates. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent authorities along with all original certificates concerning her qualifications, certificate of residence, caste certificate, etc. and thereafter, respondent No.3 shall decide the matter in accordance with law.

Sd/-
Judge
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)