



WEB COPY



W.P.No.7233 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.7233 of 2018
and
W.M.P.No.8987 of 2018

Mrs.Bharathi Devi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector
Tiruvannamalai.

2.The Block Development Officer
Arani.

3.Mrs.Lakshmi

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records from the file of the 1st respondent's notification published in WWW.TIRUVANNAMALAI.NIC.IN dated 19.01.2018 and quash the same pertaining to selection of the 3rd respondent in Serial No.753 and further direct the 1st respondent to appoint the petitioner as Primary Anganwadi Worker.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.7233 of 2018

For Petitioner	: Mr.K.Ramanamoorthy For Mr.SU.Srinivasan
For R1 & R2	: Mr.V.Arun Additional Advocate General Assisted by Mr.K.Karthik Jaganath Government Advocate
For R3	: Mr.P.Satheesh Kumar

ORDER

The appointment of the 3rd respondent as Anganwadi Worker is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2. The petitioner states that she had participated in the process of selection for appointment to the post of Anganwadi Worker. She had submitted all the relevant documents and performed well in the interview conducted by the Selection Committee. However, the 3rd respondent, who is lesser qualified and scored lesser marks was selected and appointed. The petitioner states that she falls under the category of Destitute Widow and due weightage were not granted by the authorities in the process of selection. Thus, the order of appointment of the 3rd respondent is to be quashed.



W.P.No.7233 of 2018

WEB COPY

3. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 and 2, pursuant to the interim direction issued by this Court, verified the correctness of the selection and furnished the marks statement assigned by the Interview Committee members. As per the marks awarded by the Selection Committee, the petitioner Smt.Bharathi Devi scored 38 marks and 3rd respondent Smt.S.Lakshmi scored 46 marks. Thus, the 3rd respondent was selected and appointed.

4. Regarding the merit assessments made by the Selection Committee, High Court cannot intervene, unless such assessment was made in violation of rules or tainted with the allegations of *mala fides* or corrupt activities are established. In the present case, the 3rd respondent scored more marks than the writ petitioner and thus, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief as such sought for in the present writ petition.



W.P.No.7233 of 2018

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

08.11.2022

Jeni

Index : Yes

Speaking order

To

1.The District Collector
Tiruvannamalai.

2.The Block Development Officer
Arani.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.7233 of 2018

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Jeni

W.P.No.7233 of 2018

08.11.2022