

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2644 of 2020**

- Ku. Seema D/o Shri Neelkumar Aged About 23 Years R/o Ward No. 08 Nagar Panchayat Bilaigarh, Thana And Tahsil Bilaigarh, Civil And Revenue District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Women And Child Development Department Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan, Capital Complex , Atal Nagar Naya Raipur , District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Collector Balodabajar District Balodabajar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
3. Project Officer Ekikrit Bal Vikas Pariyojna Bilaigarh, District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
4. Municipal Corporation Bilaigarh Through Its Chief Municipal Officer, Thana And Tahsil Bilaigarh , Civil And Revenue District Balodabajar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh
5. Ku. Sarawsati Netam D/o Late Shri Panchram Netam R/o Ward No. 09 Nagar Panchayat Bilaigarh, Thana And Tahsil Bilaigarh, Civil And Revenue District Balodabajar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri Sumit Shrivastava, Advocate

For Respondents/State : Shri Amrito Das, Addl. AG

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****13/07/2020**

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that in respect of the appointment on the post of Anganbadi worker, respondent No.5 Ku. Saraswati

Netam and the petitioner Ku. Seema applied and secured position in the merit list. Subsequently, the respondent No.5 was appointed and her appointment was challenged in an appeal on the ground that she is not the resident of the Ward No.8 for which the appointment was to be made and she is actually resident of Ward No.9. The said appeal preferred by the petitioner was allowed by the SDO, which was subsequently affirmed by the Collector. Thereafter, despite that the respondent authorities have not issued any order of appointment in favour of the petitioner. Under the circumstances, as of now, the petitioner submits that the petitioner though has made the representation but the same remains undecided, therefore, he prays that the petitioner may be allowed to file afresh representation before the respondent No.3 and the said representation may be directed to be decided in accordance with law.

3. Perusal of the record shows that initially the petitioner and respondent No.5 were shortlisted to be appointed as Anganbadi Worker at Bilaigarh. Subsequently, the respondent No.5 was in the merit list at serial No.1, she was appointed. Her appointment was challenged by the petitioner and the appointment of respondent No.5 was set aside by the SDO by order dated 13.05.2019 (Annexure P-2) and thereafter the said order was also affirmed by the Collector dated 07.11.2019 (Annexure P-3). Thereafter, the record shows that the petitioner has made the representation before the Project Officer, Integrated Bal Vikas Pariyojna, Bilaigarh i.e. the respondent No.3 on 23.05.2019 and 26.06.2019, which is still undecided.
4. Under the background of the case as prayed the petitioner is given liberty to make afresh representation before the respondent No.3 within a period of three

weeks from today and on such representation being filed, the same shall be decided within a further period of 90 days from the date of receipt of the copy of the representation taking into consideration the orders passed in appeal in subject matter.

5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Ashu