

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision: 28.03.2016

CWP No.2797 of 2016

Ravneesh Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab & others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

- 1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
- 2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Present: Mr. Gurcharan Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner's mother died during extension in service beyond superannuation. The petitioner's case for compassionate appointment has been rejected vide order dated 22nd April, 2015 (Annex P-6) finding no merit in the request.

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner at some length, I find no infirmity in the order of the competent authority declining the petitioner's case for compassionate appointment. The rejection is proper without any special circumstances of acute financial distress pleaded either before the Court in the present petition or before the Administration. It is well settled that compassionate appointment is not a source of recruitment and is meant only to tide over extreme financial stress and hardship caused by death of Government servant which might leave the family warding off the proverbial wolf from the door. It is not a right to succession in the service

where the employee has died from whom the claim is made. Compassionate appointments have been considered as an exception to the normal mode of recruitment to public service by the channels of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution and the jurisdiction to be exercised only in deserving cases of exceptional hardship to save a family from complete ruin which dreary picture is not presented in this case.

Consequently, the present writ petition is without any substance and hereby dismissed.

28.03.2016
Vimal

[RAJIV NARAIN RAINA]
JUDGE