

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 4109 of 2021**

1. Smt. Savitri Dhruw W/o Late Shri Premlal Dhruw Aged About 52 Years R/o Village - Chandi, Mahaveer Chowk, Police Station- Suhela, Tahsil - Simga, District - Balodabazar-Bhatapara (Chhattisgarh), District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh
2. Chandrabhan Singh Dhruw D/o Late Shri Premlal Dhruw Aged About 30 Years R/o Village - Chandi, Mahaveer Chowk, Police Station - Suhela, Tahsil-Simga, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Its Secretary, Department Of Home / Police, Mahanadi Bhavan, Mantralaya, Police Station And Post- Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District - Raipur (Chhattisgarh), District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Inspector General Of Police (Igp) Office Of Inspector General Of Police, Shankar Nagar, Raipur, Distt. Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. Deputy Inspector General Of Police (D.I.G.P.) Administration, Police Headquarters (Phq), Police Station And Post - Rakhi, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District- Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Superintendent Of Police (Sp) Office Of Superintendent Of Police (SP), Balodabazar, District- Balodabazar-Bhatapara (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. Abhishek Pandey with Ms. Laxmeen Kashyap, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Suyash Dhar, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****11.08.2021**

1. Aggrieved by the order Annexure P/2 dated 23.10.2020, refusing to grant compassionate appointment to the petitioner, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. Vide the said impugned order, the refusal for grant of compassionate appointment was on the ground that one of the sons of the deceased was in government employment.
3. The facts briefly necessary for the disposal of the writ petition is that the husband of the petitioner no.1 and father of the petitioner no.2 was in government service under the respondents working on the post of Assistant Sub Inspector who died in harness on 23.03.2020. On the date of death of Late Prem Lal Duruw he was survived by his widow and three sons. The petitioner is the youngest son. There are two elder brothers to petitioner no.2. The two elder brothers of the petitioner no.2 are already married and living separately and taking care of themselves and there family. One of the sons in the family that is the second son in the family was in government employment who obtained government employment long before the death of the deceased and he was also married much before the death of the deceased.
4. Counsel for the petitioner submits that there was also a partition of the property done so far as family property is concerned and the two sons of the deceased were all separated during the lifetime of the deceased himself. Thus on the date of death of the deceased it was the two petitioners who were directly dependent on the deceased and on his income. According to the petitioner, the two elder brothers one of whom is a farmer and other is in government employment were not financially supporting the petitioner for sustenance and petitioner herein were exclusively depending upon the income of the deceased. According to the petitioner since the two brothers of the petitioner were living

separately and had their own family to take care of and they were no longer the dependents to the deceased. Therefore only on the ground of they or one of them being in government employment could not be a ground of refusing the petitioner from being considered for compassionate appointment. To that extent the authorities have committed an error while rejecting the claim application. The authorities ought to have conducted a minimum enquiry as regards the dependency part before the impugned order was passed.

5. It is the contention of the petitioner that since brother got his employment long back and he has already married and he has his own family and children and also living separately and not supporting financially, they do not fall within the definition of dependents of the deceased. Moreover, the brother who has already married and has his own family depending upon him, cannot be considered to be a permanent source of income for the petitioner and his widowed mother for sustaining themselves. To that extent the authorities ought to have conducted an enquiry and thereafter should have taken a decision.
6. 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.
7. 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 &**

another 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 brother of Petitioner who is in government employment is providing any assistance to Petitioner or not and also whether that brother has married and has his own family or not and whether he is 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.

8. 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 dependent 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.

9. 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.”

10. 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.

11. Considering the fact that elder brother is 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.

12. 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 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.

13. Thus, for all the aforesaid reasons, the impugned order (Annexure P/2) dated 23.10.2020 deserve 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.

14. Writ Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

**Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge**

Rohit