

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 4511 of 2012**

Panch Kumari W/o. Shri Rajendra Kumar Kashyap, Aged about 32 years, R/o. Naila Bhanthapara, Ward No.1, Tahsil Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. The Collector, Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
2. The Sub-Divisional Officer (R) Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa Chhattisgarh
3. Smt. Gangotribai, W/o. Pritamlal, R/o. Naila (Bhanthapara), Ward No.1, Tahsil Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. Woman Child Development Project Officer, Navagarh, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
5. The Chief Municipal Officer, The Municipal Council, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

----Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rishi Rahul Soni, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Syed Majid Ali, Dy. G.A.
For Respondent No.3	:	Mr. Y.C. Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****19/07/2018**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order of appointment issued in favour of the respondent No.3 as an Anganbadi Worker for Center No.2 under Ward No.1 at Municipal Council, Janjgir-Naila in District Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.
2. The solitary ground for the petitioner to challenge the appointment of the respondent No.3 was that on the date when the recruitment process was initiated, the respondent No.3 had crossed the maximum age permissible for employment.
3. The counsel for the petitioner relied upon the voter list which she had in possession to question the age of the respondent No.3, wherein the

age of the respondent No.3 was reflected as 44, however perusal of the two impugned orders, particularly the impugned order (Annexure P/1), which is an order passed by the Collector, which reflects that during the course of the hearing, the Collector had found that the Higher Secondary School certificate of the respondent No.3 was produced, wherein the date of birth of the respondent No.3 was reflected as 17.11.1966 and therefore at the time of the recruitment, she was below 42 years i.e. she was only 41 years, 6 months and few days, therefore she was fully eligible to participate in the recruitment process.

4. Apart from reliance on the voter list by the petitioner, there does not appear to be any other document to establish or disprove the Higher Secondary School certificate of the respondent No.3 to doubt the age of the respondent No.3.
5. Given the facts, this Court does not find strong case made out by the petitioner for interfering with the two orders Annexure P/2 and Annexure P/1, passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer as well as by the Collector in the writ petition preferred by the petitioner against the order of appointment of the respondent No.3.
6. The writ petition thus being devoid of merits deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge