

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1405 of 2019

Smt. Anita Chouhan W/o Shri Ramesh Chouhan, Aged About 31 Years,
R/o Village Temari, Post Garra, Tahsil Saraipali, District Mahasamund,
Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Child And Women Development Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Collector, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Panchayat Mahasamund, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh
4. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh
5. Programme Officer, Integrated Child And Women Development Department, Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh
6. Smt. Sevaki Bai W/o Resham, R/o Village Temari, Post Garra, Tahsil Saraipali, District Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

---Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Ms. S. Durga Sarni, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Saleem Kazi, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

06/03/2019

1. The challenge in the present writ petition seems to be the appointment of respondent no.6 as an Anganbadi Worker under Gram Panchayat Temari.
2. The record shows that respondent no.6 was appointed as an Anganbadi worker on 24.09.2009. The petitioner did not challenge the appointment

of respondent no.6 at the appropriate time. She woke up from slumber after about 3 years when she filed an appeal before the Collector in the year 2012. The Collector dismissed the appeal on the ground of limitation vide its order Annexure P-2 dated 25.07.2012. The order of the Collector dismissing the appeal of the petitioner was also not further challenged before any other forum and the same has attained finality. The writ petition now is being filed after about 7 years from the date of rejection of the appeal by the Collector on 25.07.2012 and more than 9 years from the date of appointment of respondent no.6 as an Anganbadi worker.

3. This Court, for the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, has no hesitation in reaching to the conclusion that the writ petition suffers from delay laches in as much as there is an inordinate delay in firstly challenging the appointment of respondent no.6 before the Collector and secondly in approaching this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India after about 9 years from the date of appointment of respondent no.6.
4. The writ petition, for the aforesaid reasons, fails and is accordingly dismissed on that ground.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge