

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 5113 of 2020

Shenella Nath D/o Late Shri Rajendra Nath, Aged About 33 Years R/o - B-5, House No. 569, Priyadarshini Nagar, Raipur District - Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Managing Director, Corporation Bank, Head Office, P.A.D. (Officers Wings), Mangala Devi Temple Road, Manglore (Karnatka), Karnataka
2. Union Bank Of India, Through - Branch Manager, Raipur Ashram Road Branch, Raipur District - Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Ms. Smita Jha, Advocate
For Respondent no.2	:	Mr. Ankit Pandey, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

30.09.2021

1. The claim of the petitioner in the present writ petition is for appropriate direction to the respondents to consider and decide the claim for compassionate appointment.
2. The petitioner had made the claim on the death of her father, who was an employee under the respondent no.1 Corporation bank. By virtue of amalgamation scheme where the Corporation Bank has got merged with the respondent no.2 i.e. the Union Bank of India. The entire claim of the petitioner now stands at the disposal of the respondent no.2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that she has made an application to the respondent no.1 Bank on 30.04.2020 but till date there has been no decision taken.
3. Counsel for the respondent no.2 Bank however submits that it was on account of the administrative reasons which has arisen because of the process of merger/amalgamation, that a decision could not be taken and

he submits that in case if the application of the petitioner is still pending and further if she can still make a fresh application in accordance with the scheme of compassionate appointment applicable under the respondent no.1 Bank, the same shall be considered in accordance with the policy governing the field at the relevant time at the earliest.

4. Given the said submissions by the counsel appearing on either side, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed of directing the respondent no.2 to take appropriate decision at the earliest preferably within a period of 60 days. In case if the petitioner so wants she may further make a fresh claim before the respondent no.2 in accordance with the format and scheme for compassionate appointment available under the respondent no.1 Bank at the relevant point of time. According to the respondent no.2, prima facie, the petitioner does not have the claim for compassionate appointment on account of her marital status. This aspect would also have to be considered by the respondents while deciding the claim of the petitioner.
5. With the above observations, this writ petition stands finally disposed of.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Rohit