

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Appeal No. 408 of 2016**

Smt. Manjeeta Vishwakarma W/o Vijay Kumar Vishwakarma, aged about 32 years, R/o village Kusmusi, Tahsil Bhaiyathan, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Department of Panchayat and Rural Development, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Commissioner, Surguja Division, District Surguja, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Collector, Surajpur, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Project Officer, Unified Child Development Project, Bhaiyathan (Chandramedha) District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Bhaiyathan, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.
6. Smt. Rooma Tiwari W/o Manish Kumar, aged about 25 years, R/o village Kusmusi, Tahsil Bhaiyathan, District Surajpur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Ashok K. Shukla, Advocate.
 For Respondent/State : Shri Vinod Deshmukh, Deputy Government Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Deepak Gupta, Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Sanjay K. Agrawal, J.

Order on Board**Per Deepak Gupta, Chief Justice****06/09/2016**

1. This appeal is directed against the judgment dated 08.08.2016 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition (S) No. 3470 of 2016 dismissing the writ petition filed by the Writ Petitioner.
2. The allegations against the Petitioner was that she had annexed false and forged experience certificate alongwith her application for appointment

on the post of Mini Anganbadi Worker. She was granted job on the basis of marks for experience awarded to her on the basis of such certificate. The case of the Appellant/Petitioner is that though the certificate has been found to be forged but the Petitioner had never attached the same and the said certificate may have been used by the Project Officer on his own.

3. We are totally unable to accept the aforesaid absurd argument. It was not the Project Officer who was to be benefited. The job was to be given to the Petitioner. How would the Project Officer know as to what is the name of the Petitioner, what is her father's name, where she lives and why should a Project Officer forge a certificate to help any candidate unless he had some personal interest. The Project Officer would forge a certificate only at the behest of a candidate who has to be granted the job or benefit on the basis of such forged certificate. We cannot believe that such certificate was never submitted by the Petitioner. Even if it was prepared by the Project Officer it must have been done with an intention to give illegal and undue help to the Petitioner. This could not have been done without the knowledge of the Petitioner.

4. For the reasons stated hereinabove, we find no merit in this appeal. It is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Deepak Gupta)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE