

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

218

**CWP-9158-2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.02.2017**

Seema Devi

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice P.B. Bajanthri

Present: Mr. Naveen Daryal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Sr. DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Y.P.Malik, Advocate for respondent No.6.

P.B. Bajanthri, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has questioned the selection and appointment of the 6th respondent to the post of Anganwari Worker. Leaned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that respondent No.6 is not permanent resident of ward No.3 so as to claim for selection to the post of Anganwari Worker. Whereas, the petitioner is a permanent resident of Ward No.3 residing for the last about 15 to 16 years. It was further submitted that 6th respondent for the purpose of selection and appointment to the post of Anganwari Worker has changed her ward from ward No. 5 to ward No.3 before selection process commenced. Thus, 6th respondent's selection and appointment to the post of Anganwari worker is not in terms of the eligibility that she is not a permanent resident of Ward No.3.

2. On the other hand, learned counsel for 6th respondent submitted that as per the eligibility for the purpose of Anganwari Worker candidate must be permanent resident of particular village and criteria do not stipulate number of years of residing in a particular village. It only says that permanent resident as on the date of selection and appointment to the post of Angarwari Worker. 6th respondent was a permanent resident of ward No.3. Hence in the absence of specific criteria relating to permanent residence of village for a particular number of years, petitioner's contention is not tenable.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. Short question for consideration in the present case is whether 6th respondent's selection and appointment to the post of Anganwari Worker is in terms of the criteria laid down by the department or not. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a candidate should have been residing on permanent basis in a particular village for more than 15 to 16 years. Such a condition is not forthcoming from the criteria laid down by the Government in particularly para 4 of the criteria dated 12.08.2010.

5. In view of the facts and circumstances, the petitioner has not made out a case so as to interfere with the selection and appointment of the 6th respondent to the post of Anganwari Worker.

6. Petition stands dismissed.

27.02.2017

pooja saini

**(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasons
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No