

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

D A T E D : 26.02.2021

C O R A M

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

Writ Petition No.15303 of 2012
and
W.P.No.1 & 2 of 2012

Smt.R.Sasikala

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector
Thiruvannamalai District,
Thiruvannamalai.

2.The Child Development Scheme Officer,
Chengam Taluk,
Thiruvannamalai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to consider the Petitioner application dated 05.06.2012 and sent interview card to her and thereby appoint the Petitioner as a Anganvadi Organizer in Kalladavi Village, Chengam Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District.

For Petitioner : Mrs.P.A.Chithramani

For Respondents : Ms.Radhika
Government Advocate

O R D E R

The Petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus to consider the application dated 05.06.2012 in respect of the post of Anganvadi Organizer in Kalladavi Village, Chengam Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District.

2. It appears that applications were called for for the post of Anganvadi Organizer in the year 2010 and the Petitioner was called for an interview. In spite of participating in the interview, the Petitioner was not appointed to the said post. Instead, the first Respondent by proceedings dated February 2011 appointed Smt.R.Dhivya as an Anganvadi employee at Ayothiya Nagar, Chengam, Thiruvannamalai District.

3. Aggrieved by this decision, the Petitioner filed W.P.No.6575 of 2011 challenging the appointment of said Tmt.R.Dhivya. The said writ petition was pending on the date when the present writ petition was filed but was dismissed subsequently some time in the year 2014. According to the Petitioner, the second Respondent issued a fresh notification for appointment of Anganvadi Organizer in the year 2012 and that the Petitioner applied for the said post on 05.06.2012 by enclosing all relevant documents. In spite of such application, the Petitioner contends that she was not called for an interview or given an appointment. The present writ petition is filed in the said facts and circumstances.

4. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner fulfills all necessary qualifications for the post of Anganvadi Organizer and despite possessing requisite qualifications was unfairly not selected for the post.

5. On the other hand, the learned Government Advocate submits that Smt.R.Dhivya was found to be more suitable and also belongs to the backward class and, therefore, she was appointed in the year 2011. As regards the notification in 2012, she submits that the post has been filled up and that there are no vacancies at present.

6. In light of the submissions of the learned Government Advocate that the post that was advertised in the year 2012 has been filled up and keeping in mind the fact that several years have lapsed during the pendency of the writ petition, no useful purpose would be served by directing the Respondents to consider the application dated 05.06.2012 at this distant point of time.

7. For the reasons aforesaid, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There will be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rrg

To

1.The District Collector
Thiruvannamalai District,
Thiruvannamalai.

2.The Child Development Scheme Officer,
Chengam Taluk,
Thiruvannamalai District.

+1cc to the Government Pleader SR.12947

W.P.No.15303 of 2012

AAB (CO)
CB(19/03/2021)



WEB COPY