

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

**CWP No.16416 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision:16.08.2017**

Baljinder Kaur

--Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab & others

--Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioner.

...

TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA, J.

Petitioner invokes the extraordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India assailing the appointment of respondent No.4 to the post of Anganwari Worker. Directions are sought to the respondent/authorities to appoint the petitioner on the post instead.

During the course of arguments, counsel submits that the petitioner had applied for the post of Anganwari Worker in pursuance to an advertisement issued in the month of March, 2015 (Annexure P-1) inviting applications for recruitment to the post of Anganwari Workers/Helpers in various Women and Child Development Centres in District Fatehgarh Sahib, State of Punjab.

Perusal of advertisement at Annexure P-1 would reveal that the minimum qualifications for Anganwari Workers was stipulated as matriculation and the eligibility as regards age was stipulated between 18 to 35 years. The last date for submission of application forms was stipulated as

30.03.2015.

On a pointed query having been put, counsel would concede that as on the last date of submission of application forms, the age of the petitioner was in excess of 35 years, her date of birth being 06.10.1979.

Clearly, the petitioner was overage.

Confronted with such a situation, counsel would refer to certain guidelines for selection of Anganwari Workers appended and placed on record at Annexure P-2 in which female candidates in the age group of 18 to 42 years were eligible to apply for the post of Anganwari Workers. Even as per counsel, the guidelines at Annexure P-2 relate back to the year 1975-78. Such guidelines cannot have any applicability to the recruitment process initiated vide advertisement issued in March, 2015 at Annexure P-1. Counsel would very fairly apprise the Court that subsequent to the guidelines for selection of Anganwari Workers at Annexure P-2 which relate to the year 1975-78, amended guidelines were issued in the year 2012 and wherein upper age limit was 35 years.

The instant petition is devoid of merit and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

16.08.2017

harjeet

**(TEJINDER SINGH DHINDSA)
JUDGE**

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|--------|
| i) | Whether speaking/reasoned? | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |