

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 6332 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.07.2016.

Smt. Manoj Kumari

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

--Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.**

Present:- Mr. J.P. Jangu, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA.J**

Challenge in the instant writ petition is to the order dated 16/17.3.2016 (Annexure P-4) passed by the District Program Officer, Woman & Child Development Department, Rewari, whereby the services of the petitioner from the post of Anganwari Worker, have been terminated.

It is the pleaded case of the petitioner herself that while working on the post of Anganwari Worker she successfully contested elections for the post of Sarpanch of the village in question.

Respondent authorities issued a communication and duly served upon the petitioner whereupon she was called upon to choose one post i.e. either to continue on the post of Anganwari Worker or as Sarpanch. Petitioner having not responded to such communication, the impugned order has been passed removing her from the post of Anganwari Worker.

The basis of passing of the impugned order is revealed from a memo dated 7.9.2010 (Annexure P-1) issued from the Director, Woman and Child Development Department, State of Haryana and addressed to all Program Officers across the State. In such memo a view has been taken that when an Anganwari Worker/Anganwari Helper wins an election and

becomes the elective member of a Panchayat/Local Body, it may not be possible for such worker to discharge the duties concurrently and of necessity would take away the Anganwari Worker/Anganwari Helper away from the core activities for which such person has been engaged under the Integrated Child Development Scheme.

The decision of the respondent authorities would be within the domain of a policy decision. The basis of passing of the impugned order can well be termed as cogent and valid. It would not be for this Court in exercise of its extra ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to step in and to take a different view in the matter.

No interference is called for.

Petition is dismissed.

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)**  
**JUDGE**

**12.07.2016.**  
lucky