

**CWP-14562-2018****1****IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****(219)****CWP-14562-2018****Date of Decision : July 29, 2024****Ravinder Kaur****.. Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****.. Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Vaneet Thakur, Advocate, for
Mr. Arun Takhi, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnam Preet Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Advocate, for respondent No.6.
(joined through VC)

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. In the present writ petition, the challenge is to the order dated 22.03.2018 (Annexure P-9) by which, respondent No.6 has been appointed as Anganwari Worker.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the post of Anganwari Worker in village Sarhala Kalan, District Hoshiarpur was to be filled up and respondent No.6 though belonged to the said village but she got married four months prior to her selection and therefore, she cannot be treated as the resident of the said village so as to claim the benefit of appointment as Anganwari Worker.

3. After notice of motion, reply has been filed by the respondents.

Respondent No.6 has submitted that respondent No.6 is a handicapped

**CWP-14562-2018****2**

person and after the marriage, as her husband was a labourer, she remained in the village only and therefore, once she never left the village after her marriage and all her certificates relate to the village in question, she was rightly treated as eligible to compete and as she had better claim than the petitioner, she has been rightly selected as Anganwari Worker.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Once, the respondent No.6 presented all the documents required to be shown to be the resident of the village in question and even the petitioner has not disputed that respondent No.6 was resident of the village in question but submits that she got married three months prior to the selection, nevertheless the same will not vitiate the selection especially when, it is on record that respondent No.6 remained in village even after her marriage as her husband was a daily wage labourer and she was residing with her father.

6. There is no replication to the written statement filed on behalf of respondent No.6 to controvert the same.

7. In the absence of any rebuttal to the facts mentioned by respondent No.6 that she remained the resident of the village and had better claim than the petitioner, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Dismissed.

July 29, 2024*harsha***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)****JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No