

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 2919 OF 2018**

- Smt. Sunita Nagwanshi, W/o Late Shri Mohit Ram Nagwanshi, aged about 38 years, R/o through Rewa Ram Yadu, Mohalla Purani Basti, in front of Mahavir Akhara, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

... Petitioner**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through its Secretary, Department of Technical Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, New Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner-cum-Director, Technical Education, Directorate, Indrawati Bhawan, Block- 3, 4th Floor, New Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
3. The Principal, Government Girls Polytechnic, Byran Bazar, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)
4. Pushpkumar Nagwanshi, S/o Late Mohitram Nagwanshi, aged about 21 years, R/o Village – Khairi, Post- Gurra, Tahsil- Bhatapara, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara (C.G.) at present House No.33, Vrindaban Shaping Dream Saddhu, P.S. Pandari, Tahsil & District Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma, Advocate.
For Respondent-State	:	Mr. Lav Sharma, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****10/04/2018**

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is to Annexure P-1, dated 13.3.2018, whereby the claim of the Petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected.
2. Perusal of record would show that the claim of the Petitioner has been rejected on the ground that Respondent No.4, the eldest son of the deceased employee, is being considered for grant of compassionate appointment.
3. Undisputedly, the present Petitioner is allegedly the second wife of the deceased employee. Respondent No.4 is the eldest son born from the first wife of the deceased employee and there are two other children who are also younger to Respondent No.4 born from the first wife of the deceased employee.

4. Given the said circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality by the Respondents in processing the claim for compassionate appointment to Respondent No.4.

5. The Petitioner may not be entitled for compassionate appointment for the reason that she is getting pension to sustain with, whereas the Respondent No.4 and his two younger siblings do not have anything to survive and sustain with.

6. With the above observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge