



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 29.07.2019
CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WEB COPY

W.P[MD]No.13126 of 2015
and
M.P.[MD]No.1 of 2015

R.Jeevanantham

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Superintendent of Police (In-charge),
District Police Office,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in Na.Ka.No.A4/5985/2015, dated 14.05.2015 on the file of the respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently to direct the respondent to provide compassionate ground appointment to the petitioner within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Alagusundar
For Respondent : Mr.M.Jeyakumar
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The order of rejection dated 14.05.2015, rejecting the claim of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2.The father of the writ petitioner who was employed as Grade-I Police Constable died on 28.06.2002, while he was in service. The petitioner submitted an application seeking appointment on compassionate ground on 04.12.2003. However, the said application was not pursued and thereafter, the second application was submitted on 02.03.2015, after a lapse of about 13 years from the date of the death of the deceased employee.

3.The impugned order states that as per the memo dated 21.11.2002, the writ petitioner was directed to submit the relevant documents enabling the respondents to consider the case of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment. In spite of the repeated
<https://hservices.mca.gov.in/hservices/> by the Department, the writ petitioner had not



pursued the remedy. Thus, the writ petitioner has slept over his right in respect of the applications submitted for compassionate appointment. The second application was submitted after a lapse of 13 years on 02.03.2015. Thus, the claim of the writ petitioner was rejected in the impugned order dated 14.05.2015.

WEB COPY

4.Learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents states that as per the Government Policy, seeking appointment must be submitted within a period of three years from the date of the death of the deceased employee. Though, the department had requested the writ petitioner to submit the particulars enabling them to process the application, the writ petitioner had not pursued the remedy and submitted fresh application after a lapse of 13 years.

5.The fact remains that the deceased employee passed away on 28.06.2002 and the initial application submitted by the writ petitioner was not pursued and the second application was submitted after a lapse of 13 years and now after a lapse of about 17 years from the date of the death of the deceased employee, the scheme of compassionate appointment cannot be granted by this Court in view of the legal principles settled.

6.The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in number of cases held that the scheme of compassionate appointment cannot be granted after a lapse of many years. 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. Dependants 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."

7. 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."



8. 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 at this point of time.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-I)

/TRUE COPY/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

The Superintendent of Police (In-charge),
District Police Office,
Ramanathapuram District.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-78476[F] dated 30/07/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.S.ALAGU SUNDAR, Advocate (SR-78643[F] dated 30/07/2019

W.P[MD]No.13126 of 2015
29.07.2019

MR
JM/20.08.2019/4P/4C