

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11751 of 2013

=====

1. Sheela Devi Widow of late Virchand Patel, resident of village - Mahesh Lata
Post Vidhway, Lakhisarai, District - Munger

2. Hemant Kumar Patel Son of late Virchand Patel, resident of village - Mahesh
Leta Post Vichave, Lakhisarai, District – Munger. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna

2. Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna

3. I.G. of Police, Welfare, Bihar, Patna

4. D.I.G. of Police (Personnel), Bihar, Patna

5. I.G. Of Police Eastimate/Appeal / Welfare

6. Deputy Secretary (Home) (Police) Department Govt. of Bihar

7. District Magistrate, Nawada

8. S.P. Nawada

9. District Establishment, Deputy Collector, Nawada. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : M/s Ram Hriday Prasad and Maruti Kumari

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Arun Kumar Sinha, AC to GP-24

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 07-09-2016

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
counsel for the State.

In this case, petitioner No. 2 is claiming the
compassionate appointment on the ground that his father has died in
harness on 15.12.1993.

Sheela Devi-petitioner No. 1 filed an application
(Annexure-2) before the Superintendent of Police, Nawada for
appointment of her debar, Deokinandan Mandal on compassionate
ground, cannot be dependant on the brother, husband of petitioner No.
1, rightly the respondent-authority did not give response, for the first

time, petitioner no. 1 has sent application for appointment of petitioner No.2 as a Ball-Arachhi, letter has been exchanged between the Superintendent of Police, Nawada as well as D.I.G. of Police (Personnel), Bihar, Patna and D.I.G. of Police, Personnel repeatedly directed Superintendent of Police, Nawada to make enquiry about the interest of Sheela Devi for being appointed as Female Police Personnel as earlier she was not interested for her appointment, she always interested for appointment of his son as a Ball-Arachhi and ultimately District Compassionate Appointment Committee refused to grant the relief of compassionate appointment to petitioner No. 2.

As at the time of death of the father of petitioner No. 2, he was hardly of one year age, he could have not been appointed as either Ball-Arachhi or General Police Personnel unless the petitioner had attained the age of 10 years or 18 years respectively.

In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in the present case and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Mahesh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	18.09.2016
Transmission Date	