



WP No.36822 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03-11-2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

WP No.36822 of 2016

D.Partheepan

..

Petitioner

VS.

1.State Represented by its Secretary,
Home Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.

2.The Director General of Police,
O/o.Director General of Police Office,
Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,
Chennai – 600 004.

3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

..

Respondents



WP No.36822 of 2016

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 22.08.2016 for any post under the respondents on compassionate ground.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ambigapathi

For Respondents : Mr.S.Rajesh,
Government Advocate.

ORDER

The Writ of Mandamus is filed to direct the respondents to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner on 22.08.2016. The representation was submitted on 22.08.2016 by the petitioner to provide appointment on compassionate grounds.

2. The father of the writ petitioner served as Constable and died on 03.06.1995. The mother of the writ petitioner filed an application, seeking appointment on compassionate grounds.

3. The respondents have forwarded the application and in the



WP No.36822 of 2016

process of considering the case of the mother of the writ petitioner for providing appointment on compassionate grounds. However, she had not pursued the matter. The sister of the writ petitioner is the B.E. Degree holder and got married and settled along with her husband. Since the mother had not pursued the application, after some period, another application was filed on 09.06.2014 to provide appointment, who is son of the deceased employee and the said application was not considered, since it was submitted after a lapse of about 19 years from the date of death of the deceased employee.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the mother of the writ petitioner was called for to attend an interview. However, she had not fulfilled the requirements and therefore, her case was not considered. Thus, the fact remains that the wife of the deceased employee was not appointed and by that time several years lapsed and the petitioner submitted application after a lapse of about 19 years from the date of death of the deceased employee.



WP No.36822 of 2016

5. The Scheme of Compassionate Appointment was introduced

to mitigate the circumstances arising on account of sudden demise of the Government Employee. Compassionate appointment is not a regular appointment, nor an appointment under the constitutional scheme. It is a concession granted to the Government employees on certain exceptional circumstances. Thus, the compassionate appointment can never be claimed as a matter of right and only if a person is entitled under the terms and conditions, then alone the scheme can be extended, but not otherwise. Equal opportunity in public employment is a constitutional mandate. All appointments are to be made in accordance with the rules and by providing equal opportunity to participate in the process of selection.

6. As far as the compassionate appointments are concerned, no selection is conducted, no suitability or eligibility is tested, but persons are appointed merely based on death of an employee. Therefore, compassionate appointment is to be restricted in the interest of the efficient public administration. No doubt, the Government has also restricted the compassionate appointments and it is to be extended only to the deserving



family and more so, after a lapse of many years. Providing compassionate appointment after a lapse of many years would not only defeat the purpose and object of the scheme, but also the penurious circumstances arose on account of the sudden death became vanished. Thus, the lapse of time is also a ground to reject the claim for compassionate appointment. Number of judgments are delivered by this Court and the Government has also issued revised instructions for providing compassionate appointment in G.O.(Ms) No.18, Labour and Employment (Q1) Department, dated 23.01.2020.

7. Even recently, the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of **State of Uttar Pradesh and Others vs. Premlata [(2022) 1 SCC 30]**, has made observations in respect of implementation of the scheme of compassionate appointment and the relevant portion of the observations are extracted hereunder:

“8. 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 State of Karnataka vs. V.Somayashree [(2021) 12 SCC 20], 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 summarized the principle governing the grant of appointment on compassionate ground as under:

10.1. That the compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule;

10.2. That no aspirant has a right to compassionate appointment;

10.3. 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;

10.4. 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;

10.5. The norms prevailing on the date of



the consideration of the application should be the basis for consideration of claim for compassionate appointment.

9. As per the law laid down by this Court in a 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.

9.1. In the case of H.P. v. Shashi Kumar [(2019) 3 SCC 653], this Court in paras 21 and 26 had an occasion to consider the object and purpose of appointment on compassionate ground and considered decision of this Court in Govind Prakash Verma vs. LIC [(2005) 10 SCC 289], it is observed and held as under:

“21. The decision in Govind Prakash Verma, has been considered subsequently in several decisions. But, before we advert to those



decisions, it is necessary to note that the nature of compassionate appointment had been considered by this Court in Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana [(1994) 4 SCC 138]. The principles which have been laid down in Umesh Kumar Nagpal have been subsequently followed in a consistent line of precedents in this Court. These principles are encapsulated in the following extract:

“2. ... As a rule, appointments in the public services should be made strictly on the basis of open invitation of applications and merit. No other mode of appointment nor any other consideration is permissible. Neither the Governments nor the public authorities are at liberty to follow any other procedure or relax the qualifications laid down by the rules for the post. However, to this general rule which is to be followed strictly in every case, there are some exceptions carved out in the interests of justice and to meet certain contingencies. One such exception is in favour of the dependants of an employee dying in harness and leaving his



WEB COPY



WP No.36822 of 2016

family in penury and without any means of livelihood. 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 a member of such family a post much less a post for post held by the deceased. What is further, mere death of an employee in harness does not entitle his family to such source of livelihood. The Government or the public authority concerned has to examine the financial condition of the family of the deceased, and it is only if it is satisfied, that but for the provision of employment, the family will not be able to meet the crisis that a job is to be offered to the eligible member of the family. The posts in Classes III and IV are the lowest posts



in non-manual and manual categories and hence they alone can be offered on compassionate grounds, the object being to relieve the family, of the financial destitution and to help it get over the emergency. The provision of employment in such lowest posts by making an exception to the rule is justifiable and valid since it is not discriminatory. The favourable treatment given to such dependant of the deceased employee in such posts has a rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved viz. relief against destitution. No other posts are expected or required to be given by the public authorities for the purpose. 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. The exception to the rule made in favour of the family of the deceased employee is in consideration of the services rendered by him and the legitimate expectations, and the change in the status and affairs, of the family engendered by the erstwhile employment which



are suddenly upturned.”

“26. The judgment of a Bench of two Judges in Mumtaz Yunus Mulani vs. State of Maharashtra [Mumtaz Yunus Mulani v. State of Maharashtra, (2008) 11 SCC 384 : (2008) 2 SCC (L&S) 1077] 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. The financial position of the family would need to be evaluated on the basis of the provisions contained in the scheme. The decision in Govind Prakash Verma [Govind Prakash Verma v. LIC, (2005) 10 SCC 289 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 590] has been duly considered, but the Court observed that it did not appear that the earlier binding precedents of this Court have been taken note of in that case.”

8. In view of the fact that the deceased employee died in the year 1995 and almost 27 years lapsed from the date of death of the deceased employee, the benefit of scheme appointment on compassionate ground



WP No.36822 of 2016

cannot be granted as the penurious circumstances if at all existed during the relevant point of time. Thus the said scheme became vanished on account of efflux of time and now the petitioner cannot claim the appointment on compassionate ground, since it is a concession and not a right.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

03-11-2022

Index : Yes/No.
Internet : Yes/No.
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order.
Svn



WEB COPY



WP No.36822 of 2016

To

- 1.The Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Home Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The Director General of Police,
O/o.Director General of Police Office,
Santhome High Road,
Mylapore,
Chennai – 600 004.
- 3.The Superintendent of Police,
Tiruvannamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.



WEB COPY



WP No.36822 of 2016

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

Svn

WP 36822 of 2016



WEB COPY



WP No.36822 of 2016

03-11-2022