



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 01.02.2018

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P (MD) No.18084 of 2017

&

WMP (MD) Nos.14544 and 14545 of 2017

K.Muthumari

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The District Collector,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.

2. The District Programme Officer,
Integrated Child Development Services Scheme,
Thoothukudi
Thoothukudi District.

3. The Child Development Project Officer,
Thoothukudi Rural Block,
Thoothukudi,
Thoothukudi District.

4. J.Gangadevi

... Respondents


Prayer : This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order issued to the 4th respondent by the 1st respondent through his proceedings in A1/2485/2017-AW 309 dated 09.09.2017, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to consider and appoint the petitioner as Anganwadi Worker in Sahayamathapattinak Anganwadi Centre.

For Petitioner : Mr.L.Shaji Chellan

For Respondents : Mr.A.K.Baskarapandian, Spl.G.P.
For RR1 to 3
S.Visvalingam for R4

O R D E R

The petitioner is the candidate for the post of Anganwadi Worker in Sahayamathapattinam Anganwadi Centre. The petitioner was not selected. Instead, the fourth respondent was selected. Therefore, challenging the appointment issued in favour of the fourth respondent, this writ petition has been filed.



2. When the matter was taken up for disposal, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 to 3 produced the statement of marks awarded in favour of the writ petitioner as well as the fourth respondent. The fourth respondent is elder to the writ petitioner. She was given 8 marks, because, she was aged 31 years. The petitioner was given only four marks, because, she is aged 27 years. On account of this age difference, fourth respondent got more marks. In the selection process, after applying objective parameters, since the fourth respondent got more marks, she was selected. Therefore, the impugned order in this writ petition cannot be faulted.

3. There is no merit in this petition. This writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The District Collector,
Thoothukudi District,
Thoothukudi.
2. The District Programme Officer,
Integrated Child Development Services Scheme,
Thoothukudi
Thoothukudi District.
3. The Child Development Project Officer,
Thoothukudi Rural Block,
Thoothukudi,
Thoothukudi District.

+1cc to the Spl. Government Pleader Sr.No.46150
+1cc to Mr.L.Shaji Chellan, Advocate Sr.No.45950
+1cc to Mr. S.Viswalingam, Advocate Sr.No.45676

ARUL

VB/KK/SAR2/20.02.2018/2P/7C

W.P(MD)No.18084 of 2017
&
WMP(MD) Nos.14544 and 14545 of 2017
01.02.2018