

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision:08/07/2016.

Manjit Kaur

.....Petitioner

VS

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr.Dinesh Nagar,Advocate for the petitioner.

Jaswant Singh,J(Oral)

Petitioner is working as Anganwari Worker in District Nawanshahar. Her claim for promotion as Anganwari Supervisor has been declined vide impugned speaking order dated 23.11.2015(P-5).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Child Development Project Officer is not competent to decide the case for promotion of petitioner as Anganwari Supervisor and hence the decision is bad.

After hearing counsel for the petitioner, no case for interference is made out.

A direction was got issued to the Child Development Project Officer, Nawanshahr by the petitioner herself in previous writ petition bearing CWP No.17772/2015 dispose of vide order dated 26.8.2015 wherein the said officer was impleaded as respondent no.3. The order dated 26.8.2015 has been reproduced in the impugned order P-5. Hence the argument is not tenable.

basis of criteria of seniority-cum-merit a list of Anganwari Workers was prepared firstly at the block level and then at the district level and finally at the State level. The case of the petitioner was also considered and she was accorded seniority no.10 in the category of Scheduled Caste at the block level. Based on such assignment the merit list was accordingly prepared at District Level and State Level. A public notice was also published for inviting objection to the finally drawn up merit list at the State Level. Petitioner's name figures at Sr.No.494 of the State Level merit list prepared and the petitioner after examining her merit has certified that she has no objection to her assigned seniority at the State Level based upon which the case for appointment to the post of Anganwari Supervisor is to be made. The case of the petitioner accordingly does not fall within the zone of consideration for promotion. Accordingly, no case for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

08.07.2016
joshi

(Jaswant Singh)
Judge