

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 3450 of 2021

1. Ratandeep Meshram S/o Late Shri Yashwant Meshram Aged About 35 Years R/o Shankarpur, Sharda Chowk, Ward No. 10, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Education Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Naya Mantralaya, Naya Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. District Education Officer District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Principal Government Higher Secondary School, Gotatola, Block Mohala, District Rajnandgaon, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	: Shri B.P. Singh, Advocate.
For State	: Shri Suyash Dhar, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

09.07.2021

1. Aggrieved by the order dated 31.05.2021 Annexure P/1 whereby the claim for compassionate has been rejected by the respondent No. 2, the present writ petition has been filed. The rejection has been done on the ground that younger brother of the petitioner is in Government employment.
2. The facts relevant for the disposal of the present writ petition are that father of the petitioner Lt. Shri Yashwant Meshram working on the post of Lecturer at Government Higher Secondary School, Gotatola, Block Mohala District Rajnandgaon, died in harness on 04.04.2021. On the date of death, the deceased left behind the widow, two sons and one daughter. The younger brother of the petitioner Shri Avina

Meshram was already employed under the respondent-State and was also married and has his own family wife and children to take care of and the said brother was living separately. Thus, on the date of death of the deceased, the dependants upon him were the widow, one daughter and one son i.e. the petitioner in the case.

3. According to the counsel for the petitioner, since his brother had already got married long back and was also employed much before the deceased had died, he was not supporting the petitioner in any manner and even otherwise he has his own family responsibility and liability to take care of, thus also he was not providing any financial assistance to the petitioner or the dependence to the deceased for their sustenance
4. According to the Counsel for the petitioner, the respondents ought to have considered these aspects by way a scrutiny or an enquiry only thereafter an appropriate decision should have been taken, having not done so and rejecting the application on a hypertechnical ground, the impugned order would not be sustainable. According to the Counsel for the petitioner, the manner in which the rejection order has been passed, defeats the very purpose for which the policy for compassionate appointment has been framed by the Government.
5. The State counsel on the other hand opposing the petition submits that since the brother of the petitioner is already in government employment, in terms of the policy for compassionate appointment the candidature of the applicant has been rejected and in the

absence of any challenge to the policy, the decision of the respondent cannot be said to be bad.

6. At this juncture, it would be relevant to take note of a recent judgment passed by this Court in WPS No. 1025/2020 (Nandini Pradhan Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others). The said Writ Petition was allowed on 18.2.2020 wherein the Court has relied upon the judgment passed on an earlier occasion in the case of Smt. Sulochana Netam Vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Others in WPS No. 2728/2017 decided on 23.11.2017 wherein this Court had allowed the said Writ Petition and set aside the earlier order passed by the authorities and had remitted the matter back for a fresh consideration of the claim of Petitioner after due verification of dependency aspect, firstly upon the deceased employee and secondly whether the brothers of Petitioner who are in government employment are providing any assistance to Petitioner or not and also whether those brothers have married and have their own family or not and whether they are staying along with Petitioner or not. These are the facts which ought to have been verified while rejecting the claim of Petitioner in the present Writ Petition and which does not seem to have been considered by the authorities and they simply passed an order on hypertechnical ground specifically disentitling the Petitioner for claiming compassionate appointment in the event of family members of deceased employee being in government employment.

7. This Court is of the firm view that the intention by which the said clause inserted by the State Government in the policy of compassionate appointment was to ensure that the compassionate appointment can be given to a person whose is more needy. It never meant that in the event of there being somebody in the government employment in the family of deceased employee, the claim for compassionate appointment would stand rejected only on that ground. Moreover, in the opinion of this Court the possibility cannot be ruled out of the so called earning members and the so called persons who are in government employment from among the family members of deceased employee having their own family liabilities and in some cases are far away from the place of deceased employee and staying along with their own family. The rejection of the claim for compassionate appointment to a person who was directly dependant upon the earnings of deceased employee would be arbitrary and would also be in contravention of the intentions of framing the scheme for compassionate appointment.
8. In the case of Sulochana (supra), in paragraph 9, this Court dealing with the said issue has held as under:-

“9. In the considered opinion of this Court, in a case, where claim of compassionate appointment is made on the ground that the other member of the family had started living separately and not providing any financial help to the remaining dependent members of the family, who are at lurch, factual enquiry ought to be made by the competent authority to arrive at its own conclusion of facts as to whether this assertion of other earning member living separately is factually correct or not. If it is found, as a matter of fact, that the other earning member of the family at the time of death had already started living separately and not providing financial assistance to the remaining dependents of the family, compassionate appointment must

follow to eligible dependent of the family. However, in the enquiry, if it is found that the claim is only to get employment without there being any need because other earning member of the family is not living separately and providing financial support, compassionate appointment may not follow. The aforesaid enquiry is required to be done even though the policy does not categorically state so. The State should consider by incorporating amendments in the policy to deal with this such contingency where it is found that on the date of death of government servant, the other earning member was living separately and not providing any financial help.”

9. The aforesaid principles of law laid down in the case of Sulochana (supra) have been followed by this Court in a large number of cases and that is the consistent stand of the various branches of this Court in the past many years now. This Court is also in the given circumstances inclined to hold that the rejection of the application of Petitioner for compassionate appointment by a single line order only on the basis of the clause mentioned in the scheme or policy of compassionate appointment of the State Government would not be sustainable. There ought to have been some sort of preliminary enquiry so far as dependency part is concerned conducted by the Respondents prior to reaching to a conclusion.
10. Considering the fact that there is a brother of the petitioner in government employment, what needs to be verified is whether the said person can be brought within the ambit of dependent. Whether the said person can be compelled to take care of the petitioner and his widowed mother particularly when he has his own family and children to take care of and he has been living separately altogether. It would had been a different case if the government employee i.e. the brother of the petitioner could have been unmarried and was

living along with the petitioner which could have forced us to infer that he was there for sustenance of the family.

11. In the absence of any such situation, the policy of the State Govt. to that extent so far as compassionate appointment is concerned, has to be read down to be decided only after an enquiry which needs to be conducted by the respondents, ascertaining the dependency part and also in respect of any support which the petitioner is getting from the said brother. For the aforesaid reason, the impugned order needs to be reconsidered and the rejection of the candidature of the petitioner by strict interpretation of the policy would not be sustainable.

12. Thus, for all the aforesaid reasons, the impugned order, Annexure P-1 dated 31.05.2021 deserves to be and is accordingly set aside. The authorities are directed to re-consider the claim of the Petitioner afresh taking into consideration the observations made by this Court in the preceding paragraphs and take a fresh decision at the earliest within an outer limit of 90 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

13. Writ Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge