

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 98 of 2019**

Shantanu Bhattacharya S/o Shri Pankaj Bhattacharya, Aged About
23 Years, R/o Rajapara Road, Janakpur Ward, Tikrapara, Kanker,
District - North Bastar – Kanker, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan Mantralaya, New Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Engineering-In-Chief, Water Resources Department, Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. The Chief Engineer, Mahanadi Project, Water Resources Department, Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. The Superintending Engineer, Indravati Project Division Jagdalpur, District Bastar Chhattisgarh
5. The Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department, Raipur Chhattisgarh
6. The Collector, Jagdalpur, District Bastar Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. D. K. Vishwakarma, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Jitendra Pali, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****09/01/2019**

1. The limited grievance which the petitioner has raised in the present writ petition is the inaction on the part of the respondents in not considering the claim for compassionate appointment of the petitioner.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that his mother who was in employment under the respondents died immediately after giving birth to him. Father of the petitioner thereafter deserted him and left him with his maternal-grand-mother and has entered into a second marriage. His father is living separately and is not taking care of the petitioner. On attaining the age of majority, the petitioner had filed an application for compassionate appointment which till date has not been finalized.
3. Given the aforesaid factual matrix as has been stated by the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that no fruitful purpose would serve in keeping the petition pending, rather ends of justice would meet if the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner in accordance with the rules, regulations and the relevant scheme for compassionate appointment.
4. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion so far as the merit of the case and the entitlement of the petitioner is concerned and the authority concerned would be free to take a decision purely in accordance with the scheme applicable for compassionate appointment.
5. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge