



2026:UHC:4235

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPSS/1331/2026</u> <u>Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J</u> 1. Mr. Mohit Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. Maneesh Bisht, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand. 3. Petitioner applied for <i>Teelu Rauteli Purashkar</i>, which is given to Anganwari Karyakatri, for exceptional performance. Petitioner was not given the award and one Smt. Bharti Devi was chosen and given the award. 4. Petitioner questions selection of respondent no. 5 for the award by contending that Smt. Bharti Devi had mentioned "NA" against Column No. 9 in her application in which information was to be given regarding medical facility given to malnourished women, while petitioner mentioned in her application that she referred two malnourished child, therefore, she had a better claim and Smt. Bharti Devi was not entitled for the award. 5. Learned State Counsel was asked to get instructions. Today, State Counsel has produced in Court written instructions received by him from the Office of Director (respondent no. 2). In para 4 of the written instructions, it is stated that in case, no malnourished child or woman is found in any Anganwari Centre, then Anganwari Karyakatri concerned has to be rated as "Good Worker" and she has to be



			awarded two marks. Learned State Counsel thus submits that two marks given to Smt. Bharti Devi cannot be questioned by the petitioner, as those marks were given in view of the policy and also because of her better performance. He further submits that two marks were given to every Anganwari Centre, where no malnourished child or woman were found, therefore, there was nothing wrong in awarding marks to Smt. Bharti Devi under the said head. 6. Learned counsel for the petitioner then submits that there are other issues which petitioner wants to highlight. He submits that petitioner be permitted to make representation to the Competent Authority. 7. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of by permitting petitioner to make representation to the Director (respondent no. 2). If she makes representation within ten days from today, decision thereupon shall be taken by the Director within six weeks thereafter. It goes without saying that while passing any order adverse to the interest of respondent no. 5 (<i>Smt. Bharti Devi</i>), she shall also be given opportunity of hearing. (Manoj Kumar Tiwari, J) 29.05.2026 Aswal
--	--	--	--



2026:UHC:4235

--	--	--	--