

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 1637 of 2019**

Dhal Singh Verma S/o Late Sukhiram Verma, Aged About 50 Years,
R/o Village Daimar, Post Devada, Thana Patan, District Durg
Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Holding Company Limited Through
Managing Director, Second Floor, Vidyut Seva Bhawan, Danganiya,
Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited Through
Executive Director (Maintenance And Transmission), Second Floor,
Vidyut Seva Bhawan, Dangniya, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For petitioner : Mr. Sudeep Johri, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

08/03/2019

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order Annexure P-1 dated 09.08.2017 whereby the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment has been rejected.
2. The facts of the case are that the father of the petitioner who was working as a lineman under the respondents died in harness on 15.03.1998. It is said that the petitioner thereafter had promptly made an application for compassionate appointment in May, 1998.
3. Perusal of the record would show that in the year 1998 itself the petitioner was aged more than 36 years and it is not a case where

the petitioner was a minor at that point of time. The petitioner has now filed the writ petition only after his claim application was rejected by the respondents on 09.08.2017. Nothing prevented the petitioner from approaching the Court promptly on the respondents not processing his case for compassionate appointment from May, 1998 to Feb, 2019.

4. Moreover, perusal of the record would clearly reflect that as on date, the petitioner has crossed the age of 50 years which would by itself be a big hurdle for the petitioner in getting employment even under compassionate ground as the maximum permissible age for grant of compassionate appointment for any person other than the widow is 45 years.
5. Given the aforesaid factual matrix of the case, this Court finds it hard to entertain the writ petition or to issue an appropriate direction to the respondents in this regard. The writ petition thus fails and is accordingly dismissed.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**