

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2353 of 2019

=====

Shashi Prakash Son of Parmeshwar Prasad r/o- Mohalla-Daulatganj, P.s.-
Bhagwan Bazar, Dist- chapra(saran)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, The Principal Secretary, Energy Department, Patna
2. The Chairman, Bihar State Electricity Board patna, Bihar
3. The Secretary Bihar State Electricity Board, Bihar, Patna
4. The Chief Manager cum Chief Engineer(in-charge)North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd. Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road,Patna
5. The Deputy Chif Manager,Karmik (Personnel)North Bihar Power Distribution company Ltd Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road Patna
6. The Superintendent Engineer Tirhut Area, Bihar State Electricity Board, Muzaffarpur
7. The Deputy Director(Personnel) Tirhut Ara , Bihar State Electricity Board, Muzaffarpur, Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Santosh Kumar Verma Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma Advocate Mr. Akhileshwar Singh Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 25-02-2019 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and

the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated

30.11.2016 passed by the Respondent No. 5, whereby his

claim for being appointment on compassionate ground has

been rejected.

Without entering into the merits of the order,

which has been impugned in the present petition, this Court

would like to note that the death of the father of the



petitioner in harness took place way back in the year 2001. The claim of the petitioner is only based on the fact that the mother of the petitioner, who was in government service, was looking after other children and not the petitioner and his other sibling who were incharge of the father who died in service. The authorities did not take into account these facts, forcing the petitioner to keep on representing before them.

However, considering the fact that the death of the father of the petitioner had taken place in the year 2001 and 19 years have passed by since then, this Court does not wish to entertain this petition only on the ground that the whole purpose of providing compassionate appointment, which is to provide succor to a family in distress, would be defeated if any observation is given in this case.

For the efflux of time since the death of the employee in harness, the petition does not have any merit and the same is dismissed.

(Ashutosh Kumar, J)

skm/-

U			
---	--	--	--

