



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 26.08.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.(MD).No.10011 of 2014
and
M.P.(MD)No.1 of 2014

S.Santhanamariammal

... Petitioner

-Vs-

- 1.The Secretary,
Department of Animal Husbandry,
St. Fort George, Chennai.
- 2.The Commissioner,
Directorate of Animal Husbandry and
Veterinary Services,
Central Office Buildings, Block-II,
DMS Complex, Chennai-600 006.
- 3.The Assistant Director,
Department of Animal Husbandry,
Srivilliputhur,
Virudhunagar District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the proceedings in Na.K.aNo.48001/NI/2012, dated 13.08.2012, passed by the 2nd respondent and quash the same and further directing the respondents to provide compassionate appointment to the petitioner on the death of the petitioner's father based on the petitioner representations dated 23.11.1998, 15.07.1999 and 17.03.2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.P.Senthil

For Respondents : Mr.S.Dhayalan
Government Advocate

ORDER

The clarifications sought for from the writ petitioner by the respondents in proceeding, dated 13.08.2012, is sought to be quashed.



2.The father of the writ petitioner was employed in the respondents' department and died on 08.04.1989, while he was in service. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner states that the writ petitioner was a minor, during the relevant point of time, when her father passed away. Thus, she was not in a position to submit an application seeking appointment on compassionate grounds. After the writ petitioner attaining the age of majority, submitted an application on 23.11.1998 seeking appointment. The said application was not considered and finally the respondents in proceeding, dated 13.08.2012, requested the writ petitioner to provide some more details. Challenging the said proceedings, the present writ petition is filed.

3.The fact remains that the deceased employee passed away on 08.09.1989 and the application seeking appointment itself was filed on 23.11.1998, after a lapse of above nine years. Then after submission of the application, the writ petitioner has not pursued her remedy for the past many years. Under these circumstances, now after a lapse of above 30 years from the date of death of the deceased employee, the benefit of the scheme of compassionate appointment cannot be extended in favour of the writ petitioner.

4.In this regard, it is relevant to state the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, in the case of State of Himachal Pradesh and another vs. Shashi Kumar reported in (2019) 3 SCC 653, which reads as follows:-

"18.While considering the rival submissions, it is necessary to bear in mind that compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule that appointment to any public post in the service of the State has to be made on the basis of principles which accord with Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Dependents of a deceased employee of the State are made eligible by virtue of the policy on compassionate appointment. The basis of the policy is that it recognises that a family of a deceased employee may be placed in a position of financial hardship upon the untimely death of the employee while in service. It is the immediacy of the need which furnishes the basis for the State to allow the benefit of compassionate appointment. Where the authority finds that the financial and other circumstances of the family are such that in the absence of immediate assistance, it would be reduced to being indigent, an application from a dependent member of the family could be considered. The terms on which such applications would be considered are subject to the policy which is framed by the State and must fulfil the terms of the policy. In that sense, it is a well-settled principle of law that there is no right to compassionate appointment. But,



where there is a policy, a dependent member of the family of a deceased employee is entitled to apply for compassionate appointment and to seek consideration of the application in accordance with the terms and conditions which are prescribed by the State."

WEB COPY

5. In the case of the Government of India Vs. P.Venkatesh (Civil Appeal No.2425 of 2019), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held as follows:-

"The primary difficulty in accepting the line of submissions, which weighed with the High Court, and were reiterated on behalf of the respondent in these proceedings, is simply this: Compassionate appointment, it is well-settled, is intended to enable the family of a deceased employee to tide over the crisis which is caused as a result of the death of an employee, while in harness. The essence of the claim lies in the immediacy of the need. If the facts of the present case are seen, it is evident that even the first recourse to the Central Administrative Tribunal was in 2007, nearly eleven years after the death of the employee. In the meantime, the first set of representations had been rejected on 3 January 1997. The Tribunal, unfortunately, passed a succession of orders calling upon the appellants to consider and then re-consider the representations for compassionate appointment. After the Union Ministry of Information and Broadcasting rejected the representation on 13 November 2007, it was only in 2010 that the Tribunal was moved again, with the same result. These successive orders of Tribunal for re-consideration of the representation cannot obliterate the effect of the initial delay in moving the Tribunal for compassionate appointment over a decade after the death of the deceased employee. This 'dispose of the representation' mantra is increasingly permeating the judicial process in the High Courts and the Tribunals. Such orders may make for a quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions. But, they do no service to the cause of justice. The litigant is back again before the Court, as this case shows, having incurred attendant costs and suffered delays of the legal process. This would have been obviated by calling for a counter in the first instance, thereby resulting in finality to the dispute. By the time, the High Court issued its direction on 9 August 2016, nearly twenty one years had elapsed since the date of the death of the employee."

6. In view of the above legal principles already settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the writ petitioner is not

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



W.P.(MD).No.10011 of 2014

entitled for appointment on compassionate grounds, after lapse of so many years. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Department of Animal Husbandry,
St. Fort George, Chennai.
- 2.The Commissioner,
Directorate of Animal Husbandry and
Veterinary Services,
Central Office Buildings, Block-II,
DMS Complex, Chennai-600 006.
- 3.The Assistant Director,
Department of Animal Husbandry,
Srivilliputhur,
Virudhunagar District.

+1 CC to M/s.P.M.VISHNUVARTHANAN, Advocate (SR-83495[F] dated 27/08/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-83577[F] dated 27/08/2019)

W.P. (MD) .No.10011 of 2014
26.08.2019

sjj
MS/09.09.2019/4P.6C