



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3457]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 21557/2013

Between:

1.B.VANAJA, W/O CHINNA REDDAPPA, HINDU, AGED ABOUT 27,
OCC: NIL, R/O GOUDACHERUVUVANDLAPALLI, N.P. KUNTA
MANDAL, ANANTHAPUR DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE PROJECT DIRECTOR INTEGRATED WOMEN AND CHILD,
WELFARE DEPARTMENT, ICDS PROJECT, EAST KADIRI,
ANANTHAPUR DISTRICT.

2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ANANTHAPUR DISTRICT.

3.J KALAVATHI, W/O RAMANNA HINDU, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS,
R/O ULLINJALAVANDLAPALLI, N.P.KUNTA MANDAL, ANANTHAPUR
DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the selection of the third respondent for the post of Mini Anganwadi worker in Kadiri East, ICDS Project, N.P. Kunta Mandal, Goudacheruvuvandlapalli Village, Ananthapur District by the first respondent as illegal and arbitrary and consequently direct the first respondent to cancel the selection of the third respondent and consider the petitioner for the said post

IA NO: 1 OF 2013(WPMP 26381 OF 2013)

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the third respondent to the post of Mini Anganwadi worker in Kadiri East, ICDS Project, N.P. Kunta Mandal, Goudacheruvuvandlapalli Village, Ananthapur District pending disposal of the above writ petition

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.P RAVI KIRAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR WOMEN DEV, CHILD WELFARE

The Court made the following:

ORDER:-

The petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the appointment of the 3rd respondent as Mini Anganvadi worker.

2. The petitioner and the 3rd respondent attended the interview and respondent Nos.1 and 2 have preferred the 3rd respondent though she is not a native of Goudacheruvuvandlapalli village. It is further stated in the writ petition that the petitioner secured 352 marks in S.S.C examination whereas the 3rd respondent secured 298 marks in SSC examination and as such on merit, the petitioner deserved to be appointed and as per the notification, the 3rd respondent could not have been considered as she is not fulfilling the nativity condition as required under the notification.

3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that the selection committee has considered the nativity certificate submitted by the 3rd respondent and was satisfied that the 3rd respondent would meet the requirements for consideration of appointment. That apart, the selection committee has awarded weightage marks for the 10th class obtained by the petitioner and the 3rd respondent. The selection committee has awarded marks for the interview as well as on overall merit the 3rd respondent was preferred by the selection committee. The selection was done purely on merit and no malafides can be attributed to the decision of the selection committee.

4. Recording the same, no further orders can be passed as evidently the 3rd respondent has met all the required conditions for application and appointment.

5. With these observations, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

Date.22.04.2026
SR