

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.13377 of 2014

=====

Dhanraji Devi wife of Late Anirudh Ram, resident of Village- Patadhi, P.O.-
Kirhindi, P.S.- Sheosagar, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India and Ors
2. The Secretary, Department of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi
3. The Director General, Central Industrial Security Force, OPS Block No.- 13, C.G.O. Complex, Lodi Road, New Delhi- 110003
4. The Inspector General, Central Industrial Security Force, OPS Block No.- 13, C.G.O. Complex, Lodi Road, New Delhi- 110003
5. The Assistant Inspector General, Eastern Zone, CISF Complex, Eastern Zone, Headquarter Patna
6. The Commandant, CISF Unit, SSTPS Shakti Nagar, Uttar Pradesh
7. The Assistant Commandant, Central Industrial Force, CISF Complex, Eastern Zone, Headquarter, Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Rakesh Narayan Singh
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.S.D. Sanjay, Addl. S.G
		Mr. Ravindra Kr. Sharma, CGC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

3 16-07-2019 Heard counsel for the petitioner and counsel for the respondents-Union of India.

Claim of the petitioner is for compassionate appointment of her son. Husband of the petitioner died in harness serving as a head constable in the respondent-force.

Counter affidavit filed on behalf of Union of India discloses that in terms of extant provision contained in respect of compassionate appointment, petitioner's son had been



allowed three chances to participate in the process for appointment on compassionate ground in which he had not fulfilled requisite standard/ requirement. It is further stand in the counter affidavit that one more chance is being given to the petitioner's son to participate in the recruitment process during first half of 2015 subject to receipt of vacancy of Force headquarters.

Counsel for the petitioner fairly submits that on account of physical condition petitioner's son could not participate in subsequent opportunity given in 2015.

In view of the aforesaid fact, petitioner has no further enforceable claim on account of compassionate appointment. As claim of the petitioner has already been considered in accordance with extent provision, writ petition has no merit and the same is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

s.hassan/-

U			
---	--	--	--

