



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Reserved on	28.02.2020
Pronounced on	29.06.2020

WEB COPY

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

W.P. (MD) No.5309 of 2016

M.Manojkumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Forest Plantation Corporation Limited,
No.30, Gandhimandapam Road,
Kotturpuram,
Chennai-600 085.

2.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Forest Plantation Corporation Limited,
Karur Main Road,
Mallachipuram,
Kambarasampettai Post,
Tiruchirappalli-620 101.

...Respondents


PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order in Na.Ka.No.9260/2013/B1 dated 03.02.2016 passed by the second respondent and to quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to give employment to the petitioner under the compassionate appointment in the place of the petitioner's father late N.Manoharan, who died on 22.11.1999 in the course of employment.

For Petitioner : Mr.Niranjana S.Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.R.Karthik Rajan

O R D E R

The petitioner's father N.Manoharan, while working as a Forest Guard under the respondent Corporation, died in harness, on 22.11.1999. He was survived by his wife, two sons and one daughter. The petitioner herein, was aged about 7 years at the time of death of his father. The petitioner's mother made representations on 14.12.2011 and 22.04.2013 seeking compassionate appointment for him. After attaining majority, the petitioner had made a request for compassionate appointment on 06.04.2015 along with the No Objection letter given by his mother. The second respondent herein had rejected the request through the impugned order dated 03.02.2016 on the ground that the application was not



made within a period of three years from the date of death of the employee and that applicant should have completed 18 years of age within three years of the death of the employee. The rejection order is put under challenge in the present Writ Petition.

2. Heard Mr.Niranjan S. Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.R.Karthic Rajan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents.

3. The reasoning of the second respondent in rejecting the application cannot be sustained, in view of various judicial pronouncements of this Court, to the effect that an application made by the legal heir of the deceased employee, within three years from the date of his majority, is deemed to be made well within time. One such order passed by this Court in **W.P.No.26343 of 2012** dated **23.11.2016** in the case of **M.Sathish Kumar vs. the Director of School Education and others**, had placed reliance on two orders of the Hon'ble Division Benches of this Court and ultimately held that, when an application is made within three years from the date of attaining majority, the claimant would be entitled for appointment on compassionate grounds. The relevant portion of the order reads as follows:

'4. In this context, a Division Bench of this Court in a judgment reported in The Chief Engineer/Personnel, T.N.E.B., & another Vs. S.Suder reported in MANU/TN/0635/2009 was held as follows:

"4.In the judgment reported in 2001 Writ L.R.601 in the case of "Ramados.D. Vs. The Chief Engineer, T.N.E.B.", this Court (D.Murugesan,J) directed the consideration of the application made within a period of three years after attaining the majority by placing reliance on the very same Circular in B.P.No.46, dated 13.10.1995.

5.Subsequently, in the judgment reported in 2002(4) L.L.N.1132, (D.Murugesan,J.), in the case of "P.Ravi V.Chief Engineer (P), T.N.E.B.", also, the very same Circular was relied upon and the application for appointment on compassionate grounds was directed to be considered.

6.Justice P.D.Dinakaran, has also taken the very same view by following the very same Circular dated 13.10.1995, in W.P.No.19673 of 2003, in the order dated



WEB COPY

23.09.2003, in the case of "J.Jayakaran Vs. The Superintending Engineer, Theni Electricity Distribution Circle, Theni" and the application for appointment on compassionate grounds was directed to be considered.

7. Justice K.Govindarajan has also taken the same view in Writ Petition No.13099 of 2003, order dated 30.10.2003, in the case of "G.Muthamilselvan V. The Chief Engineer (Personnel) and Anr."

8. Justice F.M.Ibrahim Kalifulla has also taken the same view in the decision reported in 2004(3) CTC 120, (2004) MLJ 238 in the case of "Meer Ismail Ali.T. V. The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board". We are told that the order in the said case of "Meer Ismail Ali" was confirmed in the Writ Appeal by the Division Bench in W.A.No.4008 of 2004, by judgment dated 1.12.2004 and as against the said judgment dated 1.12.2004, the Special Leave Petition in Civil Appeal No.6387 of 2005, was also dismissed by the Supreme Court, by judgment dated 4.4.2005."

5. In a very similar issue, a Division Bench of this Court in W.P.No.3050 of 2003 observed as follows:

"9. Similar question came up for consideration before a Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal No.3050 of 2003 in the case of "Indiraniammal V. The Chief Engineer (Personnel) and Anr." and by judgment dated 08.03.2005, the Division Bench set aside the impugned order therein in rejecting the request of the petitioner therein for appointment on compassionate grounds and directed the Board to consider the application.

10. There cannot be a controversy in view of the settled position of law that appointment on compassionate ground is not automatic, as it would amount to back door entry to a post, by-passing the Rules to be followed for such appointment. Nevertheless, to tide over the financial constraints of a



WEB COPY

family due to sudden demise of the breadwinner of a family, the State Government or its undertaking or for that purpose, any employer, would be entitled to frame Scheme/Rules for such appointment by prescribing the conditions as well as the eligibility. Hence, the request for appointment on compassionate grounds would be considered with reference to the Scheme/Rules or any of the provisions framed for the said purpose, either by the Government or by the employers, as the case may be.

11. In the case on hand, the father of the respondent while he was working as Wireman in the office of the Assistant Engineer, TNEB, Kazhuvanthilai, Kanyakumari District, died due to illness on 07.03.1998. At the time of the death of his father, the respondent was 15 years old and for the purpose of making application for appointment on compassionate grounds, he should have completed 18 years. Hence, he could not make any application for appointment on compassionate grounds. By placing reliance on B.P.No.46, dated 13.10.1995, he made application on 3.9.2002, within a period of four days from the date of his attaining majority, i.e., 18 years. That application was rejected on the ground that the same cannot be entertained as per the Circular in vogue on the date of the application. Presumably, the order of rejection was passed on the basis of the Memo, dated 6.4.2002.

12. As we have already referred that the application for compassionate appointment is maintainable by a person within a period of three years after he/she attains the majority, irrespective of the fact that the breadwinner died while such person was a minor in terms of the proceedings of the Board in B.P.No.46 dated



of the bread-earner in the family and that there should not be any delay in such appointments. This proposition was held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Sushma Gosain vs. Union of India** reported in **1989 (4) SCC 468** had held as follows:

'It must be stated unequivocally that in all claims for appointment on compassionate grounds, there should not be any delay in appointment. The purpose of providing appointment on compassionate ground is to mitigate the hardship due to death of the bread earner in the family. Such appointment should, therefore, be provided immediately to redeem the family in distress. It is improper to keep such case pending for years. If there is no suitable post for appointment supernumerary post should be created to accommodate the applicant.'

7. The same ratio was reiterated by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Canara Bank vs. M.Mahesh Kumar** reported in **2015 (7) SCC 412**.

8. In the light of the above observations and findings, the impugned order in Na.Ka.No.9260/2013/B1 dated 03.02.2016 passed by the second respondent is set aside. Consequently, there shall be a direction to the concerned respondent to issue an appointment order to the petitioner herein, on compassionate grounds, to such post that may be proportionate to the petitioner's qualification. The concerned respondent shall ensure that the appointment order is issued atleast within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. This Writ Petition is allowed accordingly. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

DP

To

1.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Forest Plantation Corporation Limited,
No.30, Gandhimandapam Road,
Kotturpuram,
Chennai-600 085.



2.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Forest Plantation Corporation Limited,
Karur Main Road,
Mallachipuram,
Kambarasampettai Post,
Tiruchirappalli-620 101.

**Pre-Delivery Order made in
W.P. (MD) No.5309 of 2016**

29.06.2020

SPU(17.07.2020) 7P 3C