

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.150 of 2014

=====

Anjali Kumari Singh, daughter of Ram Niranjana Singh, resident of Village-
Bharpura, P.O.- Bharpura, P.S. Sonapur, District- Saran

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the General Manager, East Central Railway,
Hajipur, District- Vaishali
2. The Divisional Railway Manager, Sonapur Rail Division, Sonapur,
District- Saran
3. The Chief Administrative Officer (Construction) East Central Railway,
Mahendru Ghat, Patna
4. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Construction) Ganga Rail-cum-Road Setu,
East Central Railway, Digha, Patna
5. The District Magistrate, Saran, Chapra
6. District Land Acquisition Officer, Saran, Chapra

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ram Balak Mahto, Advocate General

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 03-04-2015 Heard Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Ashok Kumar Keshari, learned counsel

appearing for the Railways.

The petitioner seeks a direction to the authorities of the

Railways for providing a compassionate appointment by reason

that her land had been acquired by the Railways.

The facts are not in dispute and even the acquisition is

not in dispute. The dispute is whether more than one member of

the family would be provided with appointment in cases where

land has been acquired by the Railways. A copy of the order passed in a writ petition preferred by a number of persons is placed at Annexure-3 to the writ petition in which the brother of the petitioner was also a party and perusal thereof reflects that the policy mandated providing a job to only one member of the family whose land was acquired. It is not in dispute that following the order passed by this Court in CWJC No. 8283 of 2005, the elder brother of the petitioner, namely, Ashish Kumar Singh was provided with a job of a Group-D post.

The petitioner while accepting this position in paragraph-9 of the writ petition has come before this Court with the same relief.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the stipulations provided in the policy as well as of the fact that the elder brother of the petitioner has been indeed provided with a job, no case for indulgence is made out. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--