

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

**CWP No. 10586 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: 24.08.2018**

Laxmi

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA**

Present: Mr. Neeral Goyal, Advocate for  
Mr. Sanjay Vashishth, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harish Rathee, Senior DAG Haryana.

**RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)**

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner for considerable time on the issue whether the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was a resident of Village Tehrika, Tehsil and District Palwal (Haryana). The petitioner has a report in her favour from the District Programme Officer, Women & Child Development, Palwal, but, that has been reviewed by the Director, Women and Child Development Department, Haryana and the decision has been overruled principally on the ground that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was eligible and was appointed as Anganwadi Worker/Helper as she possessed a voter ID card of Village Tehrika; the Village for which selection was made including a residence certificate issued in 2004 as well as a ration card (undated) for the same Village.

The Director, Women and Child Development Department, Haryana relied on this evidence and held that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent was a resident of Village Tehrika and, therefore, there was nothing wrong in

the selection and appointment. The view taken is not to be substituted by another view which may appear more attractive in writ jurisdiction where only errors apparent on face of record and are required to be examined. Moreover, on merit, the claim of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent is superior to the petitioner.

In view of above, no ground is made out to interfere in this matter nor can the Court go into a fishing enquiry as to the place of residence of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent, when there is sufficient evidence on record to conclude on the basis of the order of the Director, Women and Child Development Department, Haryana that the eligibility condition of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent is satisfactorily proved.

With the above observations, the petition is dismissed.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)**  
**JUDGE**

**24.08.2018**

kv

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*