

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 9175 of 2019**

- Neetish Pradhan, S/o Late Turru Kumar Pradhan, Aged About 19 Years, R/o. Village Kusmisarar, Block Saraipali, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through- Secretary, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Director, Directorate, Panchayat And Rural Development Department, Indrawati Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Basna, District Mahasamund Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Shri C. Jayant K. Rao, Advocate

For Respondents/ State : Shri Soumya Rai, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****11/11/2019**

1. Heard.
2. The grievance of the petitioner is that father of the petitioner died in harness on 14.12.2006, at the time of the death of his father he was a minor, therefore, he could not apply for compassionate employment. Therefore, after attaining majority on 10.09.2018 the petitioner has applied for compassionate employment. The grievance of the petitioner is that the application of the petitioner for compassionate employment has not been decided objectively, despite the authoritative order passed by this Court in WPS No. 537 of 2015 on 10.09.2018 in case of Pushpendra Nath Sonesare

Vs. State of Chhattisgarh.

3. Considering the limited grievance of the petitioner, the petitioner Neetish Pradhan who claims that he became major on 31.07.2018, there after, he has applied for compassionate appointment and before the date he being minor, could not apply for compassionate appointment earlier, however, after attaining majority, he applied for compassionate appointment but the application is still not been decided.
4. Perused the documents and the order.
5. After perusal of the order passed by this Court in WPS 537 of 2015 supra on 10.09.2018, the application of the petitioner required consideration. Therefore, the respondent are directed to decide the application of the petitioner objectively. The petitioner shall also be at liberty to give a copy of the order of WPS No. 537 of 2015 before the concerned authority and the concern authority shall decide the same in terms of the ratio decided in the said writ petition.
6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri
Judge

Jyoti