



WEB COPY



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.09.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.4343 of 2016
and W.M.P. No.3708 of 2016

Suguna

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
(Nutritious Meal Scheme)
Thiruvannamalai District,
Thiruvannamalai.

2.The Commissioner,
Panchayat Union,
Thandrampattu,
Thiruvannamalai District.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the Order dated 27.2.2015 passed by the 1st respondent in his Office Ref: Na.Ka. No.798/2015/Sa.Vu.Thi-1, quash the same and direct the 1st respondent to consider the request of the petitioner to provide compassionate employment as Noon meal Organizer at Ayithapalayam Noon Meal Centre, Sathanur Madura ,



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

Thandrapattu Taluk, Tiruvannamalai District and pass necessary orders within the time that may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Mani

For Respondents : Mr.P.Gurunathan
Additional Government Pleader
for R1

Mrs.S.Anitha
Special Government Pleader
for R2

ORDER

The order of rejection rejecting the claim of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2.The petitioner states that her mother Kasthuri was working as a cook in the Nutritious Meal Centre, Government Girls High School, Sathanur, Thiruvannamalai District. The mother of the writ petitioner died on 25.01.2014, while she was in service. Subsequently, the petitioner submitted an application seeking appointment on compassionate ground on 13.02.2014. The petitioner states that she passed +2 examination and therefore, she is eligible for



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

appointment on compassionate ground. The said application was scrutinized and the respondents rejected the same on the ground that as on the date of death of the employee, the petitioner was a married daughter and therefore, she is not eligible for appointment. The married daughters are not eligible as per the Government Orders issued in G.O.Ms.No.165, Labour and Employment Department, dated 30.08.2010. Thus, the respondents applied the terms and conditions applicable as on the date of the death of the deceased employee. Thus, there is no infirmity in respect of the order of the rejection.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner brought to the notice of this Court that the Government thereafter, provided an opportunity to the married daughters also to secure employment on compassionate ground. But the said Government Order was issued in G.O.Ms.No.78, Labour and Employment Department, dated 21.04.2017 and in G.O.Ms.No.18, Labour and Employment Department, dated 23.01.2020, after the death of the deceased employee in the present case. Any such welfare schemes introduced or imposing new criteria cannot have retrospective application so as to reconsider the issues which were already rejected. The Government Order providing employment to the married daughters would be



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

applicable only to the prospective cases after issuance of the Government Order and in the present case, the Government order which was in force during the relevant point of time was made applicable and as per the said Government Order issued in G.O.Ms.No.165, dated 30.08.2010, married daughters are not eligible for appointment on compassionate ground. Thus, the order impugned passed by the respondents is in consonance with the terms and conditions stipulated for providing appointment on compassionate grounds.

4. Scheme of compassionate appointment is a concession and cannot be claimed as an absolute right. Scheme being an exception, cannot be expanded for the purpose of providing appointment on compassionate grounds in a larger manner. Large scale compassionate appointment would result in infringement of the Fundamental Rights of the eligible citizen, who all are aspiring to secure public employment through open competitive process. Scheme of compassionate appointment being a concession, to be implemented in a restricted manner, so as to provide appointment only to the families, who all are genuinely in penurious circumstances and in this regard, the authorities competent are bound to conduct field inspections and ascertain the imminent circumstances, warranting an



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

appointment on compassionate grounds. It is not as if one appointment is to be granted to the family of the deceased employee and it is not as if every legal heir can submit the application and thereafter, the appointment is to be considered. Once an application is filed by any one of the legal heir of the deceased employee and the said legal heir became ineligible, it is not as if that other legal legal heir can submit an application irrespective of the length of time. In the event of entertaining such repeated applications for compassionate appointment, the very purpose and object of the scheme would be defeated. The very purpose and object of the scheme of compassionate appointment is to mitigate the circumstances arising on account of the sudden death of an employee. Therefore, the scheme cannot be expanded nor any consideration is to be shown on misplaced sympathy, which would result in denial of Fundamental Right to all other eligible candidates, who all are longing to secure public employment. Thus, the Courts are not expected to grant compassionate appointment on misplaced sympathy. Such sympathy would result in unconstitutionality. Scheme being violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India, since there is no merit assessment of the applicant and there is no application of rule of reservation, there is no other assessment is made for appointment on compassionate grounds. In the event of



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

large scale compassionate appointment, the efficiency level in the public administration will also be in stake. The Rule of Reservation, merit assessment and no other assessment has been made and therefore, the large scale appointments causing inefficiency in public administration, which would result in violations of the Constitution provisions, since the Constitution mandates an efficient public administration.

5. Lapse of time would also provide a ground to draw a factual inference that the penurious circumstances aroused on account of the sudden death of an employee became vanished. Thus, Courts have repeatedly held that compassionate appointment cannot be granted after several years.

6. Even to ascertain the indigent circumstances, the pensionary benefits are also to be taken into consideration. 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.”

7. In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, **recently on 05.09.2022**, 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 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.”

8. 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 under:-

“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.



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

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

9. Thus, this Court do not find any infirmity in respect of the reasons stated in the order impugned. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.09.2022

Index : Yes
Internet : Yes
Speaking order
SSR



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The District Collector,
(Nutritious Meal Scheme)
Thiruvannamalai District,
Thiruvannamalai.
 - 2.The Commissioner,
Panchayat Union,
Thandrampattu,
Thiruvannamalai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.4343 of 2016

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

SSR

W.P.No.4343 of 2016
and W.M.P. No.3708 of 2016

27.09.2022