

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

**CWP No.26200 of 2015
Date of decision: 04.03.2020**

Sunita

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Pardeep Sehrawat, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Randhir Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate, for respondent Nos.9 & 10.

Ritu Bahri, J.

Petitioner is seeking quashing of appointment of respondent Nos.9 and 10 on the post of Anganwari workers on the ground that they do not possess the requisite qualification i.e. ration card.

In the present case, notice of motion was issued on 15.02.2016 on the short question, to be verified from the selection list (Annexure P-3), as per which, the selected candidate i.e. respondent No.9 had obtained 71 marks. The petitioner's case was that she has obtained 75 marks and has not been appointed.

Upon notice, reply on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 5 and 8 has been filed. Along with reply, they have placed on record selection list dated 26.02.2015 (Annexure R-1). As per this list, respondent No.9-Samot has obtained 77 marks. It is stated that husband of the petitioner had applied for obtaining copy of selection list through an application dated 27.05.2015 under the Right to Information Act, 2005. Thereafter, respondent No.5 had

supplied photocopy of original selection list vide letter dated 16.06.2015 (Annexure R-1). The selection list (Annexure P-3) placed on record by the petitioner is not correct and has been wrongly produced on record.

Another ground for challenging the appointment of respondent Nos.9 and 10 was that their ration card do not bear their names. In their reply, respondents have stated that as per the selection list dated 26.02.2015 (Annexure R-1), respondent No.9 has secured 77 marks and the petitioner has obtained 75 marks. The selection has been done after following due procedure of law. The criteria for appointment of Anganwari workers has been placed on record as Annexure R-2.

Respondent No.9 has filed a separate reply. Along with reply, she has placed on record copy of resident certificate dated 12.07.2013 (Annexure R-2) and ration card dated 03.07.2015 (Annexure R-3). The Haryana Resident certificate (Annexure R-2) had been issued by the Tehsildar, Rewari, which was the competent authority to do so. The latest ration card dated 03.07.2015 (Annexure R-3) bears the name of respondent No.09-Samot at serial No.06. She is reflected as daughter-in-law of Hari Har Singh.

As per reply filed by respondent No.10-Smt. Suman, her resident certificate dated 13.02.2015 (Annexure R-2) had been issued by the Tehsildar, Rewari, certifying that she is resident of village Nainsukhpura, Tehsil & District Rewari. Her ration card dated (Annexure R-3) bears her name at serial No.06.

After going through the separate replies filed by the respondents, this Court is of the view that respondent Nos.9 and 10 have been rightly appointed by the competent authority as per merits. Hence, no case is made

out to interfere in the selection process, which has been carried out as per established norms.

No merits. Dismissed.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

04.03.2020
ajp

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