

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 2366 of 2016**

Smt. Hema Banjare, W/o. Shri Rajendra Kumar Banjare,
Daughter in law of Late Shri K.P. Banjare, aged about 35
years, Occupation – House-wife, R/o. Village-Maharana Pratap
Ward, Pandariya Road Mungeli, P.S.- Mungeli, Revenue Distt.
- Mungeli, Civil Distt.- Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- PETITIONER**Versus**

1. The Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Limited,
through its Director General Manager (HRD), Daganiya,
Raipur, Distt.- Raipur (C.G.)
2. Deputy Managing Director, Chhattisgarh State Power Holding
Company Limited, Daganiya, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

..... RESPONDENTS

 For Petitioner : Mr. Sunil Sahu, Advocate.
 For Respondents : Mr. K.R. Nair, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****24/10/2016**

(1) The petitioner's father-in-law died in harness on 30.12.1999. Petitioner made an application for compassionate appointment, which was not decided leading to filing of the W.P. (S) No. 446 of 2015, in which this Court directed the Respondent/CSPDCL to consider the representation of the petitioner.

(2) By the impugned order dated 1st March, 2016, the respondent-Board has rejected the representation of the petitioner holding that she is daughter in law of the deceased government employee and as per policy dated 30.01.1997, daughter-in-law is not entitled for com-

passionate appointment, against which this writ petition has been filed questioning the same.

(3) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the order impugned and the material available on record with utmost circumspection.

(4) A careful perusal of the Circular dated 30.01.1997 would show that daughter-in-law has not been included as a member of family, who is entitled for compassionate appointment. Since the daughter-in-law is not covered under the Policy as the son of the deceased government employee is alive, view taken by the CSEB-Board that the daughter-in-law is not entitled for compassionate appointment is in accordance with law and I do not find any illegality in the order impugned warranting interference by this Court in the instant writ petition.

(5) Accordingly, the writ petition is liable to be and is hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

