

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WRIT PETITION (S) NO. 5979 OF 2019**

Siddharth Singh, S/o Rajbahadur Singh, aged about 31 years, R/o Shivanand Nagar, Sector-2, behind Akash Gas Godown, C/o Mohan Tailor, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)

**... Petitioner**

**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through its Secretary, Department of Education, Mahanadi Bhawan, New Raipur, District Raipur (CG)
2. The District Education Officer, Raipur, District Raipur (CG)

**... Respondents**

---

|                 |   |                                  |
|-----------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Petitioner  | : | Mr. Abhishek Pandey, Advocate.   |
| For Respondents | : | Mr. Somkant Verma, Panel Lawyer. |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**

**Order on Board**

**08/08/2019**

1. Challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 1.8.2018 (Annexure P-5) whereby the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment has been rejected.
2. The rejection of the claim of compassionate appointment is on the ground that the father of the petitioner is already in government employment.
3. Facts of the case are that the mother of the petitioner was working in the School Education Department as Lecturer, who died on 9.7.2016. Thereafter, the petitioner moved an application for grant of compassionate appointment on account of death of his mother, which has now been rejected vide Annexure P-5.
4. At the outset, this Court is of the view that the reason assigned for rejecting the claim for compassionate appointment cannot be said to be bad in law for the reason that both the parents of the petitioner were in government employment. Unfortunately, his mother expired on 9.7.2016. After the death of his mother, the petitioner, the son of the deceased employee, becomes directly dependent upon his father who undisputedly is working as Constable in Jail. The policy of the State Government is that the claim of a person would not be considered for compassionate appointment in case if there are other family members in the

government establishment. Moreover, what cannot be lost sight of is the fact that the compassionate appointment is not to be considered or treated as another mode of recruitment. It should be granted in case where family members are put to a state of penury or financial crisis on account of death of deceased employee. Such situation is not there so far as the present case is concerned.

5. This Court therefore does not find any strong case to be made out by the petitioner calling for an interference in the impugned order (Annexure P-5).

6. The writ petition accordingly stands dismissed.

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

/sharad/