



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.08.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WEB COPY

W.P[MD]No.12875 of 2014

and

M.P.[MD]No.1 of 2014

Arul Jeba Gnanadurai

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director of School Education,
DPI Complex, College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

2.The District Educational Officer,
Melur,
Madurai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide his proceedings in Na.Ka.No.5051/A1/2013 dated 14.07.2014 and quash the same as arbitrary and consequently direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner in any one of the available post in the respondents' office as suitable for the qualification of the petitioner within a time that may be stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Samidurai


For Respondents : Mrs.S.Srimathy
Special Government Pleader

O R D E R

The order of rejection dated 14.07.2014, rejecting the claim of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2.The mother of the writ petitioner Smt.D.Rubella, was employed as Approved Probationer in the office of the Block Resource Teacher

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



and died on 16.12.2006, while she was in service. The writ petitioner submitted an application seeking appointment on compassionate grounds on 21.09.2013, after a lapse of about 7 years from the date of the death of the deceased employee. The petitioner states that she was a graduate in M.Sc., [Biotechnology] and at that stage she submitted an application seeking appointment.

3. Even at the time of filing of the writ petition, the petitioner was aged about 36 years and now she would be 41 years. Thus, the petitioner was not only over-aged but she was highly qualified, at the time of filing of the application seeking compassionate appointment. Moreover, the application has been submitted beyond the period of three years and the same cannot be entertained as per the terms and conditions of the scheme of compassionate appointment. Thus, there is no infirmity in respect of the rejection of the claim of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment.

4. In this regard, the legal principles are settled 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."



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 legal principles settled by the Supreme Court that the scheme of compassionate appointment cannot be extended after a lapse of many years, this Court is not inclined to consider the case of the writ petitioner.



7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

WEB COPY/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

MR

To

1. The Director of School Education,
DPI Complex, College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

2. The District Educational Officer,
Melur,
Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.K. SAMI DURAI, Advocate (SR-82749[F] dated
21/08/2019)

W.P[MD]No.12875 of 2014
20.08.2019

JM/17.10.2019/4P/4C