



WEB COPY



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.35085 of 2016

R.Selvam

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Managing Director,
Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage
Board,
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai – 600 002.

2.The General Manager,
Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board,
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai – 600 002.

..Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, Direction to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 06.06.2016 in the light of the order in W.A.726 of 2013 dated 30.06.2014 for employment on compassionate grounds.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.S.Ilangovan
For M/s.Achari and Antoni Associates

For Respondents : Mr.T.Gowthaman



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

ORDER

WEB COPY

The relief sought for in the present writ petition is to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner on 06.06.2016 to provide appointment on compassionate grounds.

2. The petitioner states that his father Late D.Ramalingam worked as Field Worker in Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board. The father of the writ petitioner died on 11.12.1996, while he was in service. The brother of the writ petitioner namely R.Puvindhram submitted an application in the year 1996 to provide appointment on compassionate grounds. However, the brother of the writ petitioner also died subsequently on 12.02.2003, after a lapse of about 7 years from the date of submission of his application.

3. The petitioner has not made any application thereafter and only on 30.12.2006, after a lapse of about 10 years from the date of death of the deceased employee, the petitioner submitted an application to the respondent/Board to provide appointment on compassionate grounds. However, the respondent/Board had not considered the application



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

submitted by the writ petitioner. Subsequently, after a lapse of another 10 years, the petitioner submitted a representation on 06.06.2016 and for the purpose of disposing of the said representation, the present writ petition is filed.

4. There is no provision under the scheme of compassionate appointment to entertain the second application for compassionate appointment. The brother of the writ petitioner submitted an application during the relevant point of time and after a lapse of about 7 years, he died. Even during his lifetime, he had not pursued the application. Thus, now the application submitted by the petitioner after a lapse of 10 years from the date of death of his father is not entertainable.

5. Scheme of compassionate appointment is to mitigate the circumstances arising on account of the sudden death of an employee and it has no objectivity to provide one employment to the family of the deceased employee. Therefore, scheme being a concession, it is to be implemented strictly in accordance with the terms and conditions stipulated.



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

6. The principles regarding the compassionate appointment are laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the following cases:

(a) The Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Union of India and others Vs. Amrita Sinha*** in ***C.A.No.7640 –7641 of 2021*** dated 11.12.2021 (2021 15 Scale 174) held in Paragraph No.10 as follows :

“The monthly pension which was payable to the respondent was required to be taken into account in the award of merit points. The Tribunal, however, came to the conclusion that pension is paid for past service rendered by the employee and, hence, denial of compassionate appointment on that basis was not justifiable. This reasoning of the Tribunal is fallacious. Undoubtedly, pension is not an act of bounty, but is towards the service which has been rendered by an employee. However, in evaluating a claim for compassionate appointment, it is open to the authorities to evaluate the financial position of the family upon the death while in service. Compassionate appointment is not a vested right. It is provided in order to enable a family to tide over a financial crisis caused by the death of its wage-earner while in service. If the scheme



requires that the family pension must be taken into account in evaluating the merits an application, it has to be followed.”

(b) In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Ahmednagar Mahanagar Palika vs. Ahmednagar Mahanagar Palika Kamgar Union*** reported in ***[2022 LiveLaw (SC) 739]***, wherein in paragraph-8 of its judgment, reiterated the principles to be adopted for providing appointment on compassionate grounds as under:-

“8. Even otherwise, such an appointment to the heirs of the employees on their retirement and/or superannuation shall be contrary to the object and purpose of appointment on compassionate grounds and is hit by Article 14 of the Constitution of India. As observed and held by this Court in a catena of decisions, compassionate appointment shall always be treated as an exception to the normal method of recruitment. The appointment on compassionate grounds is provided upon the death of an employee in harness without any kind of security whatsoever. The appointment on compassionate



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

grounds is not automatic and shall be subject to the strict scrutiny of various parameters including the financial position of the family, the economic dependence of the family upon the deceased employee and the avocation of the other members of the family. No one can claim to have a vested right for appointment on compassionate grounds. Therefore, appointment on compassionate grounds cannot be extended to the heirs of the employees on their superannuation and/or retirement. If such an appointment is permitted, in that case, outsiders shall never get an appointment and only the heirs of the employees on their superannuation and/or retirement shall get an appointment and those who are the outsiders shall never get an opportunity to get an appointment though they may be more meritorious and/or well educated and/or more qualified.”

(c) Even in yet another recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA vs. NITIN** reported in [2022 **LiveLaw (SC) 690**] , wherein in paragraphs 20 and 21, it has been held as



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

under:-

WEB COPY

“20. It is well settled that compassionate appointment is an exception to the rule of equality, which enables the dependent family members of a medically incapacitated employee who has no option, but to retire, or a deceased employee, to tide over the immediate crisis caused by the incapacitation or death of the breadwinner. Compassionate Appointment excludes equally or more meritorious candidates, much in need of a job, from the zone of consideration. Consideration for compassionate appointment must, therefore, be strictly in accordance with the prevalent rules for compassionate appointment applicable to the deceased/prematurely retired employee.

21. In this case, there is a financial criteria of eligibility for compassionate appointment under the Compassionate Appointment Scheme. Rules which provide for a financial criteria for appointment on Compassionate ground are valid and lawful rules which have to be construed strictly, as otherwise the quota reserved for compassionate appointment would be filled up



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

excluding others who might be in greater and/or far more acute financial distress.”

(d) Even recently on 30.09.2022, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***The State of Maharashtra and another Vs. Ms.Madhuri Maruti Vidhate (Since after marriage Smt.Madhuri Santhosh Koli)***, reported in ***2022 LiveLaw (SC) 820***, laid down the principles as follows:

*“5. While considering the issue involved in the present appeal, the law laid down by this Court on compassionate ground on the death of the deceased employee are required to be referred to and considered. In the recent decision, this Court in the case of **Director of Treasuries in Karnataka and Anr. Vs. V. Somyashree, 2021 SCC Online SC 704**, had occasion to consider the principle governing the grant of appointment on compassionate ground. After referring to the decision of this Court in **N.C. Santhosh Vs. State of Karnataka, (2020) 7 SCC 617**, this Court has summarised the principle governing the grant of appointment on compassionate ground as under:-*

(i) that the compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule;

(ii) that no aspirant has a right to compassionate appointment;



(iii) *the appointment to any public post in the service of the State has to be made on the basis of the principle in accordance with Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India;*

(iv) *appointment on compassionate ground can be made only on fulfilling the norms laid down by the State's policy and/or satisfaction of the eligibility criteria as per the policy;*

(v) *the norms prevailing on the date of the consideration of the application should be the basis for consideration of claim for compassionate appointment.*

6. *As per the law laid down by this Court in catena of decisions on the appointment on compassionate ground, for all the government vacancies equal opportunity should be provided to all aspirants as mandated under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. However, appointment on compassionate ground offered to a dependent of a deceased employee is an exception to the said norms. The compassionate ground is a concession and not a right.*

6.1 **Govind Prakash Verma Vs. LIC**, reported in **(2005) 10 SCC 289**.....

“21.

“2.As a rule, appointments in the public



WEB COPY



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

services should be made strictly on the basis of open invitation of applications and merit.In such cases, out of pure humanitarian consideration taking into consideration the fact that unless some source of livelihood is provided, the family would not be able to make both ends meet, a provision is made in the rules to provide gainful employment to one of the dependants of the deceased who may be eligible for such employment.It must be remembered in this connection that as against the destitute family of the deceased there are millions of other families which are equally, if not more destitute.

26.Mumtaz Yunus Mulani v. State of Maharashtra [(2008) 11 SCC 384] has adopted the principle that appointment on compassionate grounds is not a source of recruitment, but a means to enable the family of the deceased to get over a sudden financial crisis.....

7. Thus, as per the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions, compassionate appointment is an



exception to the general rule of appointment in the public services and is in favour of the dependents of a deceased dying in harness and leaving his family in penury and without any means of livelihood, and in such cases, out of pure humanitarian consideration taking into consideration the fact that unless some source of livelihood is provided, the family would not be able to make both ends meet, a provision is made in the rules to provide gainful employment to one of the dependants of the deceased who may be eligible for such employment. The whole object of granting compassionate employment is, thus, to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis. The object is not to give such family a post much less a post held by the deceased.

7.1.Even otherwise, she shall not be entitled to appointment on compassionate ground after a number of years from the death of the deceased employee.”

(e) Yet another judgment in the case of ***Fertilizers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd & Ors. Vs. Anusree K.B.*** reported in **2022 LiveLaw (SC) 819**, the Apex Court held as follows:

“9.The whole object of granting compassionate employment is, thus, to enable the family to



tide over the sudden crisis. The object is not to give such family a post much less a post held by the deceased.

9.1. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions to the facts of the case on hand and considering the observations made hereinabove and the object and purpose for which the appointment on compassionate ground is provided, the respondent shall not be entitled to the appointment on compassionate ground on the death of her father, who died in the year 1995. After a period of 24 years from the death of the deceased employee, the respondent shall not be entitled to the appointment on compassionate ground. If such an appointment is made now and/or after a period of 14/24 years, the same shall be against the object and purpose for which the appointment on compassionate ground is provided.”

7. In the present case, the employee died in the year 1996 and now almost 26 years lapsed and at this length of time, the compassionate appointment cannot be granted. Even lapse of time is also a ground to deny appointment, since the penurious circumstances if at all existed during the relevant point of time, when the employee died, cannot be taken into consideration after a lapse of several years.



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

WEB COPY 8. This being the principles to be followed, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief of compassionate appointment. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

09.11.2022

Index : Yes
Speaking order: Yes
kak

To

1. The Managing Director,
Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage
Board,
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai – 600 002.
2. The General Manager,
Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board,
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai – 600 002.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.35085 of 2016

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

kak

W.P.No.35085 of 2016

09.11.2022