

In the High Court of Judicature at Madras

Dated : 29.08.2017

Coram :

The Honourable Mr.Justice S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. No.7724 of 2015

and

W.M.P.Nos. 8639 & 20827 of 2017

Mrs. K.Uma

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The State,
Represented by the Secretary
to the Government of Tamil Nadu,
P & AR Department,
(Personal Administrative Reform Department),
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
3. The District Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the 3rd Respondent vide Proceedings No.1/33518/13 dated 22.10.2013 and to quash the same and further direct the Respondents to consider the request of the petitioner for the compassionate appointment of her son, K.Santhosh Kumar in the Tamil Nadu Police Department.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.K.R.Pandiyan

For Respondents : Mr.K. Dhananjayan,
Special Government Pleader.

O R D E R

The order of rejection dated 22.10.2013, passed by the third respondent in respect of the claim of the writ petitioner

for compassionate appointment to her son is under challenge in this writ petition.

2. The impugned order states that the writ petitioner had submitted her application for compassionate appointment after a lapse of 7 years, 3 months and 23 days, thus, the same cannot be considered.

3. The husband of the writ petitioner late S.Kishore Kumar was working as Head Constable (No.516) and died on 02.06.2006, while he was in service. Thus, the writ petitioner was in penury, on account of the sudden demise of her husband. However, the application seeking compassionate appointment was submitted after a lapse of seven years. Thus, the order of rejection passed by the third respondent in this regard is in order and there is no infirmity.

4. Compassionate appointment is a scheme and an exception. Thus, the same is to be made in accordance with the instructions issued by the Government. The authorities competent are bound to follow the instructions in its strict sense and therefore, as far as the case on hand is concerned, the reason stated for rejection cannot be interfered with.

5. This Court is of the opinion that consideration for appointment on compassionate ground is to be construed as violation of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and is only in the nature of concession and therefore does not create a vested right in favour of the claimant. A compassionate appointment scheme is a non-statutory scheme and is in the form of a concession and it cannot be claimed as a matter of right by the claimant to be enforced through a writ proceeding. A compassionate appointment is justified when it is granted to provide immediate succour to the deceased employee. Mere death of a Government employee in his harness, it does not entitle the family to claim compassionate employment. The competent authority has to examine the financial condition of the family of the deceased employee and only if it is satisfied that without providing employment, the family will not be able to meet the crisis, that a job is to be offered to the eligible member of the family of the deceased employee.

6. The concept of compassionate appointment has been recognised as an exception to the general rule, carved out in the interest of justice, in certain exigencies, by way of a policy of an employer, which partakes the character of service rules. That being so, it needs little emphasis that the scheme or the policy, as the case may be, is binding both on the employer and the employee. Being an exception, the scheme has to be strictly construed and confined only to the purpose it seeks to achieve.

7. The philosophy behind giving compassionate appointment is just to help the family in harness to get over the immediate crisis due to the loss of sole breadwinner. This category of appointment cannot be claimed as a matter of right after certain period, when the crisis is over. More so, the financial status of the family is also to be looked into as per the scheme framed by the employer while giving compassionate appointment and such appointment cannot be conferred contrary to the parameters of the scheme.

8. It is pertinent to note the fact that in a liberalized world as of today, there are plenty of avenues of employment available to the general public. Most of the people are not entirely dependent on the income of a single member of the family. Keeping this new social structure in mind, it would be seemingly right for the Courts to ensure that there is no abuse of the scheme of compassionate appointment either by the employer or by the applicant/claimant.

9. The million dollar question is 'Whether offering 'appointment' on compassionate ground (i.e., sympathy) is the only option /solution to mitigate 'hardship and distress of the family of an employee dying in-harness? The answer is an emphatic 'No'. Firstly, the Rules, as such, contain no provision to ensure that the dependent who gets appointment shall continue to maintain other dependents.

10. A 'welfare state' like ours is free to initiate effective welfare scheme/s- and no one will be in a position to oppose. It is well settled that sympathy cannot be allowed to override statutory or Constitutional provisions, particularly when it is quality of the question of Welfare of the entire society and /or question of Governance. State like ours is free to wed the 'solemn object' to serve the society at large, purely according to the mandate under the Constitution of India. State cannot be allowed to look after 'welfare' of its own employees and their families alone.

11. In this view of the matter, this Court has to examine the scope of the scheme. The scheme being an exception, the authorities competent has to implement it in its strict terms. Equal opportunity in a public employment is a Constitution mandate.

12. All the recruitment process under the rules are made by the Competent Authorities by implementing the rules of reservation under the Constitution of India. This apart the regular competitive process has got a method of screening the candidates on merits even for the reserved categories. These two aspects are vital in regular recruitment process:

- First is adherence of the Rules of Reservation under the Constitution of India;
- Second is the comparative merit amongst the candidates who are participating in the regular competitive process.

13. In case of compassionate appointments, no such constitutional mandated requirements have been followed. Thus, very scheme itself is an exception and not in accord with the constitutional scheme. Compassionate appointment scheme as a special one necessarily to be restricted to the extent possible, so as to provide appointment only to the genuine and warranting families. This apart, the over all strength of the compassionate appointees should not exceed more than the restricted level and if such a kind of special appointments are increased in the public posts, this Court is of the view that the efficiency level in the public administration will certainly be affected.

14. In respect of the Rules of Reservation, the same has not been followed in compassionate appointment. Thus large number of compassionate appointments will have certain implication on the Rules of Reservation and the same will certainly have an impact on the Constitution of India, more specifically, on the principles of reservation. In respect of the merit aspect, no competitive examination or interview are conducted for compassionate appointees. Thus the very capability of the candidates in performing the administrative duties itself will be in question. Certain amount of merit assessment is certainly required for appointing a candidate in any public posts.

15. Thus, the concept of compassionate appointment itself is to be reconsidered by the Government and it should be restricted so as to provide appointment only to the legal heirs of the deceased in genuine circumstances. Otherwise, the scheme of compassionate appointment will have a negative impacts on the good governance and further, it will affect the chances of the meritorious candidates, who can participate in the public administration in the better manner.

16. Rules of Reservation being a constitutional mandate any scheme violating the same has to be implemented cautiously and restrictedly. Thus, genuineness of the claim made by the person on compassionate grounds to be strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions and further, the State cannot be going on extending the scope of compassionate appointment so as to dilute the principles of reservation under the Constitution.

17. Such being the scope of the scheme, Courts are also to be cautious, while extending the benefit of compassionate appointment in favour of the legal heirs of the deceased employee and the legal presumption in this regard is that the

indigent circumstances certainly vanishes after a lapse of long years.

18. At this juncture, it is useful to refer to the Judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in the case of The Inspector General of Prisons vs. P.Marimuthu reported in {2016 (5) CTC 125}, wherein, the Division Bench, in paragraph Nos. 36 to 41, has held as follows:

"36. In National Institute of Technology v. Niraj Kumar Singh reported in 2007 (2) SCC 481, an employee died, leaving behind his wife. She made an application to the respondent therein, for appointment of her grandson on compassionate grounds. Thereafter, he was appointed on daily wages and his services were extended from time to time. After a gap of about 15 years, he made an application for his appointment on compassionate grounds on regular basis. Thereafter, wife of the deceased employee, sought for appointment for her son and while claiming so, she also requested cancellation of the respondent's appointment. As her request was rejected, she filed a writ petition, which was dismissed. One of the reasons assigned for dismissal of the writ petition filed by the wife was that at the time of death of the deceased employee, her son was aged one and half years old and that the application was submitted only after attaining majority i.e. after 18 years and therefore, no appointment can be given to the employee's son on compassionate ground. Letters patent appeal was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Division Bench. There were other issues of making a false claim by the grandson. Suo-motu contempt notice was issued. On the above facts and considering the policy of the Government, at Paragraphs 21 and 22, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, held as follows:

"21. The appointment on compassionate ground, thus, could have been offered only to a person who was the widow of the deceased or a dependent child. Admittedly, the son of the deceased Ashutosh Kumar was only one year old at the time of his father's death. He could not, thus, have been given any appointment on compassionate ground. It may be true that Smt. Vidhya Devi filed an application for

grant of appointment on compassionate ground in favour of the respondent. But, it now stands admitted that he was not the natural grandson of late Shri B.P. Sinha but was a grandson of his cousin brother. Therefore, he was not entitled for appointment in terms of the scheme of the Institute. The Institute, therefore, committed an illegality in granting him such an appointment. Moreover the purported the

appointment on compassionate ground had been given in 2001, i.e., after more than 15 years from the date of death of the said Shri B.P. Sinha.

22. If the appointment of the respondent was wholly illegal and without jurisdiction and such an appointment had been obtained by practising fraud upon the appellant, the same was a nullity. We are, however, not oblivious of the fact that the same attained finality in view of the fact that the writ petition of the said Vidhya Devi was dismissed. Despite the same, the principles of res judicata shall not apply in a case of this nature. It is well-known that where an order is passed by an authority which lacks inherent jurisdiction, the principles of res judicata would not apply, the same being nullity. [See Chief Justice of A.P., v. L.V.A.Dixitulu, 1979 (2) SCC 34 and Union of India v. Pramod Gupta (D) by LR's. And Ors., (2005) 12 SCC 1]"

37. Though learned counsel for the writ petitioner submitted that under the existing scheme, and the Government orders issued from time to time, on the aspect of considering the right of the minors, at the time of death of breadwinner, in making an application for employment assistance, on attaining majority, there are no rules or guidelines restricting the period, for consideration of such application and further submitted that what is relevant to be considered by the authorities, is whether the penury of the family continued to exist, or not, even after a long time and it should be the only objective factor, to subserve proper implementation of the scheme and further contended that when the scheme does not

contemplate that on the date of death of the employee, the applicant should be an adult

member irrespective of the period prescribed for submission of the application, this Court is not inclined to accept the said submissions, for the reason that even if indigent circumstances of the family continued to exist for a long time, the scheme of employment assistance on compassionate grounds and modified by various Government orders issued from time to time, makes it clear that though indigent circumstance is one of the factors to be considered, while examining the eligibility of an applicant to seek for employment assistance, equally, the other requirement under the Government orders issued from time to time, that the application should be submitted within three years from the date of death, cannot be ignored. A member of the family, otherwise eligible, on the date of death of the employee, has to submit the application within three years from the date of death or in a given case, if he was a minor at the time of death aged between 15 to 18 years, he can also submit an application, within three years from the date of death, on attaining majority.

38. Needless to state that for entry into any service in the State, the minimum age is 18 years, and no minor can be appointed to any service. Therefore, he cannot make any application for appointment to any post in service and no post can be kept vacant for him, till he attains majority. Posts which fall vacant have to be filled up as per the recruitment rules. Employment assistance on compassionate appointment, is only a concession, extended to an eligible member of the family, to apply for a suitable post, in the service, in which, the employee/Government servant died in harness and it is not a right, which can be exercised by a minor on attainment of majority.

39. Thus, for the reasons stated supra, we are of the view that continuation of penury or indigent circumstances of the family, alone is not the factor to be considered by the department, while examining the request of an applicant for appointment on compassionate grounds. Reading of the Government orders shows that scheme can be extended only to eligible member of the family and not to an ineligible person. Scheme has not been framed to provide employment assistance as and when the son or daughter of the deceased employee attains majority. Under the scheme, the department is not obligated to keep any post vacant, till the applicant attains majority or to consider his candidature on attaining majority. Scheme only enables those who are eligible and satisfy all the eligibility criteria including age, within three years from the date of death.

40. In view of the above discussion, the request of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds, ought not to have been entertained, as on the date of application, he was minor, aged about 12 years. Reference can also be made to a decision made in Sushma Gosain v. Union of India reported in 1989 (4) SCC 468.

41. In the result, the Writ Appeal is allowed. No costs. Order made in W.P(MD) No.6538 of 2009 dated 22.04.2014 is set aside. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed."

19. In view of the above, this Court is of the view that the grounds raised in the writ petition have no further consideration and accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, there is no order as to costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar (CS III)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

1. The State,
Represented by the Secretary
to the Government of Tamil Nadu,
P & AR Department,
(Personal Administrative Reform Department),
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
 2. The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai - 600 009.
 3. The District Superintendent of Police,
Cuddalore District.
- + 1 cc to M/s.G.K.R.Pandiyar, Advocate, SR.62256
+ 1 cc to The Govt.Pleader, SR.62722

W.P. No.7724 of 2015

CNR(CO)
NR 12/10/2017



WEB COPY