

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

**THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE
RAGHVENDRA SINGH CHAUHAN**

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

W.A.No.1650 of 2018

Date: 12.04.2019

Between:

The Deputy Managing Director &
Corporate Development Officer,
State Bank of India, Head Office,
Mumbai and others.

...Appellant

and

Smt. Bano Bee

...Respondent

Counsel for the appellants : Ms. V. Uma Devi

Counsel for the respondent : Ms. G. Madhuri (Not Present)

The Court made the following:

JUDGMENT: *(per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice Raghvendra Singh Chauhan)*

The State Bank of India and its officials, appellants, are aggrieved by the order dated 19.09.2018, passed by a learned Single Judge in W.P.No.10679 of 2004, whereby the learned Single Judge has directed the bank to consider the application filed by the respondent-petitioner for compassionate appointment.

The learned counsel for the appellants submits that the learned Single Judge has directed the appellants to consider the application filed by the respondent, Smt. Bano Bee, for appointment on compassionate ground by observing that *"The mere fact that the respondent was paid the terminal benefits would not oust her case for compassionate appointment."* According to the learned counsel, such an observation is contrary to the scheme floated by the bank for granting the compassionate appointments. Therefore, the said observation prevents the bank from rejecting the application filed by the respondent-petitioner on the said ground.

Heard the learned counsel for the appellants and perused the impugned order.

A bare perusal of the impugned order clearly reveals that in the operative portion of the order, the learned Single Judge had merely directed the appellants *"to re-examine the case of the respondent and to consider her application for appointment under compassionate appointment scheme and pass appropriate orders within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of*

the said order.” Therefore, the contention raised by the learned counsel for the appellant is clearly misplaced. For, the learned Single Judge has not directed to ignore the receipt of the terminal benefits by the respondent. In fact, the learned Single Judge has left it wide open to the appellants to reject the case of the respondent, if necessary, but in accordance with law.

Therefore, this Court does not find any merit in the present petition. It is hereby dismissed.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous Petitions, pending if any, shall also stand dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(RAGHVENDRA SINGH CHAUHAN, ACJ)

(A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J)

Date: 09.04.2019
va