



Serial No.32
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 169 of 2025

Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Smti. Nilu Devi,
W/o (L) UBSI Anup Singh.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The State of Meghalaya represented by
The Secretary, Ministry of Home,
Government of Meghalaya, Shillong.
2. The Director General of Police,
Meghalaya, Shillong.
3. The Assistant Inspector General Police (A)
Shillong, Meghalaya.

...Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Mr. R.Jha, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Ms. S.Shyam, GA.



- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in Law journals etc: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT AND ORDER (ORAL)

1. Heard Mr. R.Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. S.Shyam, learned GA for the State respondents.

2. By this application, the writ petitioner who is stated to be the wife of a deceased UBSI in the Police Department who expired on 08-05-2021, is seeking directions for consideration for appointment on compassionate ground, and also for recall of the Notification dated 02-12-2010, whereby the Compassionate Appointment Scheme in the State of Meghalaya has since been withdrawn.

3. Mr. R.Jha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the State being first and foremost a welfare State, the withdrawal of the Notification of Compassionate Scheme Appointment unfortunately, is without any basis or justification, and has rendered and placed many people in grave financial difficulty due to the death of their breadwinners. He submits that as the husband of the writ petitioner had died in harness, the respondents are duty bound to afford her appointment on compassionate grounds.



4. Ms. S.Shyam, learned GA appearing for the State respondents, in reply has submitted that firstly, it is not a case where the petitioner has been rendered destitute, inasmuch as, apart from receiving a monthly family pension of ₹ 21,900/-, she has also received a total amount of ₹22,80,588/- lakhs as terminal benefits after the death of her husband. Further, with regard to the prayer of revocation or recall of the Notification dated 02-12-2010, learned GA submits that this is a matter of policy taking into account the situation, as such, in this regard no mandamus can issue.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, no doubt, as canvassed by the learned counsel for the petitioner, a scheme for compassionate employment is a welcome initiative for the welfare of the dependants of persons who have died in harness. However, the same is also dependent on other factors which hinges upon the policy decision made on due examination by the State respondents, an area or policy where the Court cannot dictate the State respondents.

6. In coming to the case of the petitioner, it is seen and submitted, and placed on affidavit that adequate financial benefits have already been accorded, coupled with the fact that substantial monthly pension is regularly being received. As such, on this aspect, there is no question that the petitioner has been put to any financial distress.



7. In view of the observations and discussions made hereinabove, there being nothing further to consider in this writ petition, the same is closed and disposed of.

Judge