



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 13.09.2021

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.19433 of 2020

T. Pandi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu,
Transport Department,
St. Fort George, Secretariat,
Chennai.

2. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Byepass Road,
Head Office, Madurai.

3. The General Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Byepass Road,
Head Office, Madurai.

4. The Branch Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Usilampatti Road,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling the order of the respondent dated 19.11.2019 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to give compassionate appointment to the petitioner within the time frame as fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr. S. Saji Bino
For Respondents : Mr. A.K. Manikkam,
Standing Counsel for Government
for R1
Mr. J. Senthil Kumaraiah
Standing Counsel
for R2 to R4



ORDER

This Petition is filed for the issuance of a Writ issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling the order of the respondent dated 19.11.2019 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondent to give compassionate appointment to the petitioner within the time frame as fixed by this Court.

2. The case of the petitioner is that his father was working as Senior Driver in the respondent Corporation and he died in harness on 21.08.2008 while he was in service, leaving behind the petitioner and his mother as legal heirs. Thereafter on attaining majority, the petitioner submitted a representation, dated 04.05.2018, to the respondents seeking appointment on compassionate grounds. However, the respondent has rejected the application without considering the Government Orders. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition before this court.

3. The learned Government Counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that it is mandate that while applying for compassionate appointment, the candidate must be a major and possessed requisite education qualification. Furthermore, as per the Government Order in G.O.(Ms) No.18, Labour and Employment (Q1) Department, dated 23.01.2020, the time limit to prefer application for compassionate appointment is three years from the date of death of the employee. But, the petitioner herein was minor at the time of death of his father and after attaining majority, he has submitted application after a lapse of nearly ten years and hence, the respondent has rightly rejected the petitioner's application for compassionate appointment.

4. I have anxiously considered the rival submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials placed on record.

5. Identical issue came up before the Honourable Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.1749 of 2019 (**Sudhanthira Devi vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and others**), by Judgment dated 03.09.2019, following the decisions of the Honourable Supreme Court, has held that applications for compassionate appointment submitted beyond the period of three years cannot be entertained.

6. In **Government of India and another v. P.Venkatesh [(2019) 15 SCC 613]**, the Honourable Supreme Court has held as follows:

"8. This 'dispose of the representation' mantra is increasingly permeating the judicial process in the High Courts and the Tribunals. Such orders may make for a quick or easy disposal of



cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions. But, they do no service to the cause of justice. The litigant is back again before the Court, as this case shows, having incurred attendant costs and suffered delays of the legal process. This would have been obviated by calling for a counter in the first instance, thereby resulting in finality to the dispute. By the time, the High Court issued its direction on 9-8- 2016, nearly twenty one years had elapsed since the date of the death of the employee.

9.

10. Bearing in mind the above principles, this Court held: (Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 138) SCC pp.141-42, para 6)

"6. For these very reasons, the compassionate employment cannot be granted after a lapse of a reasonable period which must be specified in the rules. The consideration for such employment is not a vested right which can be exercised at any time in future. The object being to enable the family to get over the financial crisis which it faces at the time of the death of the sole breadwinner, the compassionate employment cannot be claimed and offered whatever the lapse of time and after the crisis is over."

Judgment 7. The Honourable Full Bench in Paragraph No.13 of the dated 11.03.2020 in W.P.(MD) No.7016 of 2011 has held as follows:

"13. In the light of the above we find that the judgment in the case of A.Kamatchi v. The Chairman, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, (2013) 2 CWC 758 is not only contrary to the law laid down in the case of E.Ramasamy v. The Chairman, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, (2006) 4 MLJ 1080, but it also has, as indicated by our brother, Justice Subramonium Prasad, in his judgment, misconstrued the same. In view of what has been indicated above we are also of the view that the period of three years is a rationale and reasonable period under the relevant Government Orders and the rules. We may, however, observe that it is open to the State Government to make any provision for relaxation of the period in exceptionally rare cases on the principles as indicated herein above."



8. Furthermore, G.O.(Ms) No.18, Labour and Employment (Q1) Department, dated 23.01.2020, has clearly prescribed the time limit to prefer application for compassionate appointment as three years from the date of death of the Government servants.

9. In the case on hand, admittedly, the petitioner's father died on 21.08.2008 and the petitioner, after attaining majority, submitted application for compassionate appointment only on 04.05.2018, nearly after a lapse of ten years. Therefore, in view of the above settled legal position, the claim of the petitioner made beyond the prescribed period of three years cannot be entertained and it deserves to be rejected. Accordingly, the impugned order does not warrant any interference of this Court.

10. In fine, the writ petition fails and it is dismissed.
No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

mnr

Note : In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To:

1. The Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu,
Transport Department,
St. Fort George, Secretariat,
Chennai.
2. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Byepass Road,
Head Office, Madurai.
3. The General Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Byepass Road,
Head Office, Madurai.



4. The Branch Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,
Usilampatti Road,
Madurai District.

WEB COPY

+1 CC to M/s.SPL. GP (SR-29199[F] dated 15/09/2021)

W.P. (MD) No.19433 of 2020

13.09.2021

MGJ/JC (01.11.2021) 5P 6C