CGHC010353902026 2026:CGHC:43956

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 4874 of 2026

1 - Smt. Kunti Bai Sahu W/o Late Ashok Kumar Sahu Aged About 54 Years Resident Of Village Botechang, Gram Panchayat Botechang, Tehsil Bhanupratappur, District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh

RAVVA UTTEJ KUMAR RAJU

2 - Smt. Sakila Mandavi D/o Jagdev Mandavi Aged About 24 Years Resident Of Nareti Tola, Gram Panchayat Hamatwahi, District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioners

Versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Women And Child Development, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Director Women And Child Development Department, Government Of Chhattisgarh, Raipur.

3 - Collector District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh.

4 - District Programme Officer Women And Child Development Department, District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh.

5 - Child Development Project Officer (C.D.P.O.) Integrated Child Development Services (I.C.D.S.), Bhanupratappur Project, District North Bastar Kanker.

6 - Project Officer Integrated Child Development Services (I.C.D.S.), Durgukondal Project, District North Bastar Kanker.

7 - Chief Executive Officer Janpad Panchayat, Durgukondal, District North Bastar Kanker, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

(Cause title is downloaded from CIS Periphery.)

For Petitioners	**:**	Mr. Samuel David, Arpit N. Thomar along with Mr. Abhishek Nirala, Advocates.
For State	**:**	Mr. Anand Dadariya, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad.

Order on Board

12.10.2026

1. By way of the present petition, the petitioners seek protection of their fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 21 and 25 of the Constitution of India, along with appropriate consequential directions to the respondents to prevent unlawful interference by private individuals in the discharge of their duties as Anganwadi Workers/Anganwadi Assistants. The petitioners are seeking for following reliefs:-

> *"10.1 Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, particularly a writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondents to permit and facilitate the Petitioners to discharge their respective duties as Anganwadi Workers/Anganwadi Assistants in accordance with their appointments, and to ensure that no private individual, village group, informal body or other person*

not authorised by law obstructs or interferes with the discharge of their official functions;

10.2 Direct the Respondents to release to the concerned Petitioners all honorarium and other amounts lawfully payable to them which have been withheld on account of their inability to discharge their duties arising from the circumstances complained of herein, after due verification in accordance with law and to ensure that no such amount is withheld except pursuant to a lawful order passed by the competent authority;

10.3 Direct the Respondents to provide adequate protection to the Petitioners, as may be necessary, against threats, intimidation; social boycott or other unlawful interference on account of their religious faith, and further direct the Respondents to ensure that the functioning of Anganwadi Centres and the discharge of official duties are regulated only by the competent authorities under law and are not made dependent upon the consent or approval of private persons or informal village bodies;

10.4 Declare that the action and inaction of the Respondents in permitting the Petitioner to be unlawfully prevented from discharging her official duties, despite there being no order of suspension,

removal or disengagement, is arbitrary, unconstitutional and violative of Articles 14, 21 and25 of the Constitution of India;

10.5 Pass such other or further order(s), direction(s) or writ(s), including an orders as to costs, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case."

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners, fairly submits that the present writ petition, insofar as it relates to a service dispute, is not maintainable in its present form, as such a dispute is not amenable to the writ jurisdiction of this Court in the present proceedings. He further submits that, since the petitioners have also raised grievances regarding alleged interference by private respondents in the discharge of their duties, the maintainability of the writ petition would have to be considered in that context. Accordingly, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed as not maintainable in its present form.

3. Learned State counsel submits that the writ petition is not maintainable in its present form, as the petitioners have appropriate alternative remedies available in law to redress their service-related grievances and complaints regarding alleged interference by private individuals.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court finds that the chief grievance of the petitioners is that they are being prevented by

private respondents from discharging their duties as Anganwadi Workers/Anganwadi Assistants. The petitioners may ventilate their grievance before the competent authorities and, in the event their grievance remains unredressed, avail themselves of the appropriate remedy available to them in accordance with law. If the grievance pertains to a service dispute, the petitioners may pursue the appropriate proceedings before this Court, subject to their maintainability in law. Similarly, if the grievance concerns unlawful interference by private individuals, the petitioners are at liberty to avail themselves of the appropriate remedy before the competent court. This Court further observes that the private respondents against whom the allegations of interference have been levelled have not been impleaded as parties to the present petition.

5. In view of the nature of the relief sought and the aforesaid deficiencies, this writ petition, in its present form, is not maintainable and is accordingly **dismissed**, with liberty to the petitioners to avail themselves of the appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

6. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

U.K. Raju