



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

**[3457]**

**TUESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY-FOUR**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 11617/2013**

**Between:**

Chintala Kameswari

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

Government of India and Others

**...RESPONDENT(S)**

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.Nagendra Babu. U

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.A Samir Kumar Reddy (SC FOR CGSC)

2.Harinath N (DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA)

3.GP for Women Dev, Child Welfare

**The Court made the following:**

**ORDER:**

No representation for the petitioner today when the matter is called.

2. The petitioner challenging the proceedings dated 10.01.2013 whereby the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent issued proceedings appointing the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent as Anganwadi Health Worker.

3. It is submitted in the petition that the petitioner also applied for the post of Anganwadi Health Worker in pursuance of notification dated 30.01.2012. The petitioner is said to have performed well in the selection process,

however, the respondents No.1 to 4 have appointed the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent as Anganwadi Health Worker. Challenging the same, the present writ petition is filed.

4. The respondents in their counter submitted that the selection committee has preferred the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent based on the performance in the interview. The petitioner secured 36.70 marks and whereas the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent secured 37.17 marks. A copy of the merit list of the candidates is also filed along with the counter. It is submitted that the writ petition is filed basing on presumptions of the petitioner and that the selection process has been transparent. It is submitted that the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent is in service ever since the appointment.

5. In view of the above facts and circumstances and since now that the selection is completed in accordance with the merits, this Court finds no grounds to interfere in the said proceedings and thus, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, in the Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

---

**JUSTICE HARINATH.N**

31.12.2024

KMS

**135**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**

**W.P.No.11617 of 2013**

**Date: 31.12.2024**

KMS