

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

101

**RSA-439-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision:16.04.2018**

Smt. Shashi Bala

... Appellant

Versus

Smt. Snehlata and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate for the appellant.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

CM-926-C-2017

This is an application for condonation of delay of 49 days in filing the appeal. Heard. In view of the reasons mentioned in the application and affidavit, same is allowed. Delay of 49 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

Main case.

Matter relates to selection and appointment to the post of Anganwari Worker. Appellant's contention is that the post pursuant to the advertisement for Anganwari Worker was reserved for ward No.22. Therefore, respondent No.1-Smt. Snehlata's selection and appointment cannot be considered in view of the fact that she is not resident of Ward No.22. Undisputedly appellant has secured lesser marks than the respondent No.1-Smt. Snehlata. Perusal of the advertisement it is evident that the post of Anganwari Worker is not reserved for Ward No.22. In other words, two mohallas namely Kanungo Mohalla and Bass Mohalla have been taken into consideration for the purpose of selection and appointment. Since advertisement do not disclose that post of Anganwari Worker is ear-marked

for ward No.22 alone. Appellant has not made out a case so as to interfere with order of appellate court, so also selection and appointment of respondent No.1-Smt. Snehlata as she more merited than the appellant.

2. Accordingly, appeal stands dismissed.

16.04.2018

pooja saini

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

Whether speaking/reasons

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No