



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.07.2022

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.D. AUDIKESAVALU

W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

and

W.M.P. No. 28403 of 2017

K.Rajalakshmi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The District Collector,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.

2. The Integrated Child Development Officer,
Cuddalore (Villages),
Cuddalore.

3. S.Sankari

... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the First Respondent to cancel the selection and appointment of the Third Respondent as Anganwadi Paniyalar in the Kalaiur Anganwadi Centre, Kalaiur (village) and direct the First Respondent to appoint the Petitioner as Anganwadi Paniyalar in the Kalaiur Anganwadi Centre, Kalaiyur (village).



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

For Petitioner : Mr. M.Gnanasekar
For Respondents : Mr. V.Arun,
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mrs. C.Sangamithirai
Special Government Pleader (for R1)
Mr. V.Jayaprakash Narayan (for R2)
No appearance (for R3)

ORDER

Heard Mr. M.Gnanasekar, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. V.Arun, Learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Mrs. C.Sangamithirai, Learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the First Respondent and Mr. V.Jayaprakash Narayan, Learned Counsel for the Second Respondent and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. Though the Third Respondent has been served, she has not entered appearance either in person or through counsel.

2. The Petitioner and the Third Respondent had applied for the post of Anganwadi Worker in Kalaiur Anganwadi Centre, Kalaiur Village, Cuddalore District and the Third Respondent had been selected to that post, which has been challenged by the Petitioner in this Writ Petition.



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

WEB COPY

4. The contention raised in the Writ Petition is that the Petitioner is a resident of the same hamlet in which the Anganwadi Centre is located, but the Third Respondent, who is not a resident of that hamlet has been selected to that post. It has been highlighted that in terms of clause 2.8 of G.O. (Ms) No. 110, Social Welfare and Nutritious Meal Programme (SW7) Department dated 14.05.2012 issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu, it is only when candidates residing within the same hamlet are not available that selection of candidates from neighbouring Panchayats within a radius of 10 kms could be made.

5. This Court by order dated 17.06.2022 had directed the First Respondent to verify as to whether the residences of the Petitioner and the Third Respondent were situated within the same hamlet at the time of making the application for the said post after issuing notices to them. In furtherance to the said order, additional Counter-Affidavit dated 13.07.2022 has been filed stating that after issuing notices to both parties, it was found that the Third Respondent is a resident of Thirupanampakkam Village and the Petitioner is a resident of Kalaiyur Village where the Anganwadi Centre is located. It is also revealed from that additional Counter-Affidavit that the Petitioner alone belongs to Kalaiyur Village and all



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

other candidates do not belong to that village. In such circumstances, the

appointment of the Third Respondent, which cannot be sustained, is set aside and

the First and Second Respondents shall issue necessary orders appointing the

Petitioner to the said post within a period of one month from the date of receipt

of copy of this order. This view taken is fortified by decision of the Division

Bench of this Court in ***K.Lakshmi*** ***-vs- District Collector, Cuddalore***

(Order dated 31.07.2017 in W.A. No. 2728 of 2012). In order to avert any

disruption of the functioning of the Anganwadi Centre, the concerned authorities

shall make necessary arrangements in that regard and are not precluded from

continuing the services of the Third Respondent till the Petitioner joins duty in

the said post.

6. Since it has been established that the appointment of the Third Respondent is not in accordance with law, the Petitioner shall be entitled to costs of Rs. 5,000/- payable by the First and Second Respondents, in addition to return of the receipt of the fixed deposit for Rs. 5,000/- which had been handed over by the Petitioner to the Registry in terms of the order dated 01.03.2022 passed by the Court with endorsement to collect that amount with interest from the bank concerned for the same.



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

WEB COPY In the result, the Writ Petition is ordered on the aforesaid terms with costs.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

14.07.2022

skr

Index: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 27.10.2022.

To

1. The District Collector,
Cuddalore District,
Cuddalore.
2. The Integrated Child Development Officer,
Cuddalore (Villages),
Cuddalore.

Copy to

1. K.Rajalakshmi,
W/o. Kaviarasan,
No. 1/1A, Main Road,
Kalaiyur Village and Post,
Cuddalore.
2. S.Sankari,
W/o. Sathiyadevan,
No. Jothi Nagar,
Erandyiramvuagam,
Cuddalore (T.K.),
Cuddalore District – 607 109.
3. The Registrar-General,
Madras High Court,



Chennai – 600 104.

WEB COPY



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

skr

W.P. No. 26672 of 2017

14.07.2022