



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA

KALABURAGI BENCH

DATED THIS THE 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

WRIT PETITION NO.203968 OF 2025 (S-DIS)

BETWEEN:

SMT. BHAGYAJYOTHI W/O GOUTHAM,
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS
OCC: ANGANAWADI WORKER
CHIDRI-3, ANGANAWADI CENTRE, BIDAR
R/O BIDRI COLONY BIDAR
TQ. AND DIST. BIDAR-585 403.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. ARUNKUMAR AMARGUNDAPPA, ADVOCATE)

AND:



1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPT. OF WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT,
REPRESENTED BY ITS UNDER SECRETARY
VIDHAN SOUDHA, BANGALORE-01.
2. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER,
AND PRESIDENT ANGANWADI WORKERS/HELPERS
SELECTION COMMITTEE,
BIDAR, DIST. BIDAR-585 401.
3. THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR,
DEPT. OF WOMEN AND CHILD WELFARE
DEVELOPMENT,
TQ. BIDAR, DIST. BIDAR-585 401.



4. THE CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT OFFICER,
DEPT OF WOMEN AND CHILD
WELFARE DEVELOPMENT, BIDAR
TQ. AND DIST. BIDAR-585 403

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. MALLIKARJUN SAHUKAR, AGA)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF CERTIORARI AND MANDAMUS AND GRANT ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT IN THE FOLLOWING TERMS.
1) QUASH THE IMPUGNED ORDER OF TERMINATION BEARING NO. ಉನಿಬೀ/ಮಮಅಇ/ಅಂ.ಕಾ.ಕ./ಅಂ.ಸ/ಮಾ.ಆ.ಹಿಂ.ಕು/2025-26/3366 DATED 21.11.2025 ISSUED BY THE RESPONDENT NO.3 VIDE ANNEXURE-C CONSEQUENTLY DIRECT THE RESPONDENTS TO REINSTATE THE PETITIONER INTO SERVICE WITH FULL BACK WAGES AND CONTINUITY OF SERVICE.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING IN 'B' GROUP, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP SINGH YERUR

ORAL ORDER

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate appearing for the respondents.

2. This petition is filed seeking to quash the termination order dated 21.11.2025 bearing No.ಉನಿಬೀ/ಮಮಅಇ/ಅಂ.ಕಾ.ಕ./ಅಂ.ಸ/ಮಾ.ಆ.ಹಿಂ.ಕು/2025-26/3366,



passed by respondent No.3, vide Annexure-C and consequently direct the respondents to reinstate the petitioner into service with full back wages and continuity of service.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the permanent resident of Bidar town, Taluk and District Bidar. She was selected as an Anganwadi helper about 22 years back. After considering length of long standing service, she was promoted as an Anganwadi worker. Pursuant to her promotion, she has been working in the department of Women and Child Welfare Development and discharging her duties as an Anganwadi worker in the Anganwadi Centre. It is further contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been discharging her duties to the satisfaction of the superior officers. Considering the service of the petitioner, the department of Panchayat Raj has issued a Felicitation Certificate appreciating the petitioner's service during COVID period.



4. This being the state of affairs, respondent No.4 along with the supervisor started making baseless allegations and got issued notice to the petitioner with regard to improvements to be made while discharging the duties. Respondent Nos.2 and 3 acting on the aforesaid notice of respondent No.4, claimed to have conducted proceedings on the allegations that the petitioner remained unauthorised absent since two years, did not perform well in the given scheme and despite issuance of notices, there was no reply and respondent No.3 on the oral instructions of respondent No.2, recalled appointment of the petitioner as Anganwadi Worker attributing allegations, misconduct, negligence and irresponsibility in discharge of duties.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner never remained unauthorised absent, neither did she act negligently or irresponsibly, while discharging her duties attached to the said post. It is further contended that the respondent No.4 along with



Zonal Supervisor has falsely implicated the petitioner. It is further contended that the petitioner has got relevant documentation to show that she has been discharging her duties regularly. It is also contended that the petitioner has been terminated from the post of Anganwadi worker based on the allegations of misconduct, which attributes stigma without conducting any enquiry, without following the principles of natural justice and non consideration of the reply submitted by the petitioner. Therefore, he contends that the entire process is illegal, contrary to law and the fundamental principles of natural justice. Therefore, the termination has to be set aside on the ground of it being illegal and arbitrary.

6. *Per contra*, learned Additional Government Advocate for the respondent vehemently contends that the respondent-authorities have issued notice to the petitioner and an inspection has been conducted. She was not found to be performing her duties diligently or responsibly. Based on the report, she has been terminated due to her



non-performance, negligence and being irresponsible. Therefore, he contends that there is no illegality or perversity in the impugned order of termination.

7. Having heard counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Government Advocate, it is not in dispute that the petitioner was initially working as an Anganwadi helper and thereafter, promoted as an Anganwadi worker. It is also not in dispute that the petitioner has worked for more than 20 years. Notice is issued to the petitioner on the ground of misconduct and showing irresponsibility and not doing her duty in accordance with the requirement. The petitioner has replied to the notice, but no enquiry is conducted and no procedure is followed, much less the principle of natural justice of giving an opportunity of hearing and thereafter, passing a speaking order. Even if the respondent-authorities make out a case of negligence of duty and misconduct, it is a fundamental requirement of issuance of notice and an opportunity of hearing to be given to the



petitioner. Only after that, an order of termination could be passed, which could be again subject to the test of reasonableness and fairness.

8. In present case on hand, admittedly, no enquiry is conducted and the petitioner has not been provided an opportunity of hearing. Therefore, the impugned order of termination cannot be sustained and the order is perverse and illegal and requires to be quashed.

9. Accordingly, I pass the following:

ORDER

- i. Petition is ***allowed***.
- ii. The impugned order of termination bearing No.

ಉನಿಬೀ/ಮಮಅಇ/ಅಂ.ಕಾ.ಕ./ಅಂ.ಸ/ಮಾ.ಆ.ಹಿಂ.ಕು/20

25-26/3366 dated 21.11.2025, issued by

respondent No.3 vide Annexure-C is hereby



quashed. Petitioner shall be reinstated with continuity of service.

- iii. Respondents are at liberty to initiate action, if any, following due process of law.

Sd/-
(PRADEEP SINGH YERUR)
JUDGE

RSP,NJ
List No.: 1 SI No.: 82
CT:SI