

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

-

-

**WRIT PETITION No.35733 of 2015**

-

**DATED : 04.11.2015**

Between :

Koppaka Suryanarayanamma,  
W/o.Neela Babu, Aged about 25 yrs,  
R/o.Peda Kandipudi Village,  
Butchayyapeta Mandal, Visakhapatnam District,  
Andhra Pradesh State.

.. Petitioner

and

The State of Andhra Pradesh,  
rep., by its Principal Secretary,  
Women Development Child Welfare & Disabled  
Welfare Department,  
Secretariat of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad & 2 others.

.. Respondents

This court made the following :

**THE HON’BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

-  
-

**WRIT PETITION No.35733 of 2015**

-

**ORDER :**

Petitioner claims to be the resident of Peda Kandipudi Village, and is a graduate. Petitioner applied to the post of Anganwadi worker/helper in Anganwadi center, P. Kandipudi Village, Butchayyapeta Mandal, Visakhapatnam District. In pursuant to the notification dated 19.09.2015 the petitioner was selected and an order of appointment was issued on 28.10.2015. The petitioner is working consequent to the said appointment. This writ petition is filed alleging that illegally the original copy of the appointment order is taken away by the Child Development Project Officer, (3<sup>rd</sup> respondent) and the same may be returned to the petitioner.

2. The averments in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition do not show any cause of action for the petitioner to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court. According to the petitioner, the petitioner was appointed as Anganwadi worker/helper and consequently petitioner has joined the service and has been working. If that is so, merely because somebody has taken the original copy, how it affects the continuation of petitioner in the post is not disclosed. The petitioner has not stated as to why the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent took away the original copy of the appointment order. Petitioner has not complained to the higher authorities against the alleged illegal taking away of the original copy of appointment order. The petitioner cannot invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this court seeking prayer as sought in the writ petition more so, when no adverse action is taken by the authorities affecting the right of the petitioner, warranting interference by this Court.

3. The writ petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out her remedies on the issue of her appointment and alleged action of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent in taking away the original copy of appointment order. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand dismissed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**P.NAVEEN RAO,J**

04<sup>th</sup> November, 2015

Rds

