



CGHC010363022026



2026:CGHC:44156

SOURABH
BHILWAR

Digitally signed by
SOURABH BHILWAR
Date: 2026.10.16
10:42:46 +0530

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7486 of 2026

Benimadhav Kuldeep S/o Late Anirudh Kumar Aged About 38 Years R/o
Vinayak Vihar, Ambedakar Nagar House No. 4 Dd Nagar Raipur District
Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner

versus

**1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, GAD, Mahanadi Bhawan,
Mantralaya, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)**

**2 - Raipur Development Authority (RDA), Through Chief Executive
Officer (CEO), Bhakta Mata Karma Commercial Complex, GE Road,
New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur (C.G.)**

... Respondents

(Cause title is taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Rahul Ambast, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	: Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.2	: Mr. Amrito Das, Senior Advocate through VC assisted by Mr. Yashkarn Singh, Advocate

(HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE BIBHU DATTA GURU)

Order on Board

13/10/2026

1. By the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks a direction towards the respondent authorities to consider the case of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment on account of death of his father.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's father, who was working as a regular employee on the post of Pumpman under respondent No.2, died in harness on 08.10.1999, when the petitioner was only 11 years old. He submits that the petitioner's mother had applied for compassionate appointment immediately after the death of the deceased employee; however, the respondent authorities kept the application pending and, only in the year 2020, informed the petitioner that compassionate appointment could not be granted. He further submits that after attaining majority and acquiring the requisite educational and technical qualifications, the petitioner submitted several representations in the years 2017, 2018 and 2019 seeking consideration of the claim, but no reasoned order was passed. He submits that there has been no intentional, deliberate or negligent delay on the petitioner's part in approaching this Court, as the claim remained pending with the respondent authorities and the petitioner was informed of its rejection only in the year 2020. He, therefore, prays for appropriate direction regarding compassionate appointment.
3. On the other hand, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 submits that the petitioner has failed to produce

any acknowledgment or receipt in support of his claim that he submitted an application seeking compassionate appointment in the year 2019. He further submits that the present writ petition, having been filed after an inordinate delay of more than 26 years from the date of death of the deceased employee, is not maintainable and also contends that such appointment cannot be claimed after such a prolonged lapse of time. He, therefore, submits that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed on the grounds of inordinate delay and laches, as well as the absence of any enforceable right to claim compassionate appointment.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents available on record.
5. From perusal of the record, it is evident that the father of the petitioner died in harness on 08.10.1999, whereas the present writ petition has been filed after an inordinate delay of more than 26 years seeking grant of appointment on compassionate ground. The petitioner has failed to establish any sufficient or satisfactory explanation for such an extraordinary delay in approaching this Court. The mere submission that the respondent authorities informed him about the rejection of the claim in the year 2020 does not, in the facts of the present case, satisfactorily explain the delay in approaching this Court.
6. The petitioner claims that he had submitted a representation; however, there is neither any acknowledgment nor any receipt on the record to establish that the said representation was, in fact, submitted before the competent authority. Even otherwise, no

satisfactory or plausible explanation has been furnished for the extraordinary delay and prolonged inaction in approaching this Court. No exceptional circumstance has been brought on record warranting condonation or overlooking of such delay.

7. It is well settled that the object of compassionate appointment is to provide immediate financial assistance to the bereaved family to overcome the hardship arising from the death of the employee in harness. Such appointment cannot be claimed as a matter of right after an inordinate lapse of time. In view of the unexplained delay of more than 26 years and the failure of the petitioner to establish any sufficient ground for entertaining the petition at this belated stage.
8. It is also settled that a person invoking the extraordinary and discretionary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India must approach the Court with due diligence and within a reasonable period of time. The writ jurisdiction is not intended to provide relief to a litigant who has remained inactive for an unduly long period and thereafter seeks to revive a stale claim.
9. The Court is required to examine whether such an enormous delay deserves to be condoned in the absence of any cogent and satisfactory explanation. Ignoring such delay may cause prejudice to the rights and interests which may have accrued in favour of the other parties and may also unsettle matters which have otherwise attained finality. The principles underlying the doctrine of delay and laches are founded upon the considerations of

repose, certainty and finality. A litigant who sleeps over his alleged rights for an inordinate period cannot, as a matter of right, invoke the discretionary writ jurisdiction of this Court at a belated stage.

10. In the considered opinion of this Court though there is no period of limitation provided for filing a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, yet ordinarily a writ petition should be filed within a reasonable time. In the case at hand, the petitioner filed the instant writ petition after 26 years claiming the compassionate appointment.
11. There is another facet to the matter. Compassionate ground appointments are a welfare measure intended to enable the family of the deceased employee to immediately tide over the sudden financial crisis caused by the death of the employee. However, it is also important to state that the appointment on compassionate grounds is not intended to create a windfall for the kin of the deceased but only to keep the kitchen fire burning.
12. Long delay on part of the petitioner in the instant case will also invite the presumption that the financial crisis of the family has ceased to exist.
13. In the wake of the above discussion the rationale/conditions for grant of compassionate appointment to the petitioner do not survive.
14. The whole object of granting compassionate employment by an employer being intended to enable the family members of a deceased or an incapacitated employee to tide over the sudden financial crisis, appointments on compassionate ground should be

made immediately to redeem the family in distress [see: [Sushma Gosain v. Union of India](#) (1989) 4 SCC 468].

15. Furthermore, the Division Bench of this Court in the matter of ***Ankit Kumar Navik vs. State of Chhattisgarh and Others*** considered the identical issue and dismissed the appeal holding therein that the grant of compassionate appointment after a long time is not permissible. It has also observed that the compassionate ground appointments are not intended to create a windfall for the kin of the deceased. The employer is only required to assess the financial condition which keeps the kitchen fire burning. Subsequently the matter travelled upto the Supreme Court in SLP No. 3586/2026 which has been dismissed by order dated 03.07.2026 and affirmed the order passed by the Division Bench of this Court.
16. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, applying the well settled principles of law, and considering the inordinate and unexplained delay in raising the claim, this Court is not inclined to exercise its extraordinary writ jurisdiction in favour of the petitioner.
17. Accordingly, the writ petition is **dismissed** *in limine* on the ground of **delay and laches**.

Sd/-
(BIBHU DATTA GURU)
JUDGE