

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 46 OF 2017

Vandana Shravan Dabhade @
Vandana Bharat Jadhav

.. **Petitioner**

Versus

The Chief Engineer,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Ltd. and others

.. **Respondents**

Shri B. G. Sagade, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Shri Avinash R. Salve, Advocate for Respondents.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATE : 4th June, 2018

PER COURT :

1. Mr. Sagade, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the mother of the petitioner was a permanent employee of respondent. While in employment the mother of the petitioner died on 2nd May, 2008. On 13.11.2009, the petitioner being the only daughter applied for appointment on compassionate ground with respondent no. 3. Respondent no. 3 raised some queries. The petitioner clarified the said queries made by respondent

no. 3. Thereafter, the proposal was forwarded to respondent no. 2 and respondent no. 2 forwarded the proposal to respondent no. 1. However, no decision was taken. Again the petitioner made representation in the year 2016, still no action is taken by the respondent. The respondents have sat over the application of the petitioner. The petitioner is not responsible for the delay. The petitioner immediately had applied for appointment on compassionate ground. The respondent be directed to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground.

2. Mr. Salve, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner even today has crossed the upper age limit and the case of the petitioner cannot be considered.

3. The petitioner is a married daughter. The mother of the petitioner had died on 2nd May, 2008. No doubt, it appears from the record that the petitioner made application in the year 2009. The petitioner could have approached the court earlier if no steps were taken. The purpose of compassionate appointment is to provide immediate succour to the members of the family of a

person who has died in harness. Ten years have lapsed since the death of mother. The petitioner is residing with her husband. The petitioner has also crossed the upper age limit.

4. In the view of aforesaid, the claim of the petitioner cannot be considered.

5. Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed of. No costs.

[SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.] [S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

marathe