



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1019 WRIT PETITION NO. 3697 OF 2023

VARSHA SHIVDAS THENGADE
VERSUS
THE ADDITIONAL DIVISIONAL COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Sujit S. Kulkarni and Mr. M.O.
Deshpande h/f Mr. Tekale Nikhil S,
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. P.P. Dawalkar
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 & 3 : Mr. Jagatkar Amol Anantrao
Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr. Satyajit B. Pawar h/f Mr. Bhosale
Mahesh S.
...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
DATE : 17.12.2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the respective parties.
2. By way of present petition, the petitioner assails the orders dated 17.05.2022 passed by respondent No. 2 - the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad in case No. GPO/SBVSO/Astha/Kavi/2022/440/, Zilla Parishad Aurangabad, whereby the appointment of petitioner was cancelled. The petitioner also assails the order dated 21.07.2022 passed by respondent No. 3 the Child Development Project Officer, Kannad-1, whereby the order of appointment of petitioner as Anganwadi Sevika was set aside. The said order was confirmed by Additional Divisional Commissioner vide order dated 23.02.2023 in case No. 2022/DB/Appeal/Cell/CR/54.
3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to

the advertisement issued by respondent No. 2, the petitioner participated in the selection process wherein she secured highest marks and was appointed on the post of “Mini Anganwadi Sevika” at Thokal Wasti Anganwadi. Respondent Nos. 4 and 5 filed a complaint against her before the Chief Executive Officer, Aurangabad on the ground that she was not resident of Thokal Wasti. The CEO, cancelled her appointment and the same was also confirmed by the Additional Divisional Commissioner.

4. The Counsel for the petitioner failed to show any record purporting that the petitioner is resident of Thokal Wasti. As per G.R. dated 13.08.2014 a specific condition has been put that the candidate must be resident of village, wherein, he/she has been appointment. Admittedly the petitioner did not belong to the village Thokal Wasti, and therefore, the Chief Executive Officer has cancelled her appointment order and the same was also confirmed by the Additional Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad.

5. Considering the above, I do not find any reason to interfere with the orders passed by the Chief Executive Officer, the Child Development Project Officer and the Additional Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

6. In view thereof, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to cost.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)