



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 25.02.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. (MD)No.765 of 2021

R.Ramadevi

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Principal Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Highways Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Director General,
Integrated Chief Engineer's Office,
HRS Campus, 76, Sardar Patel Road,
Guindy, Chennai-600 025.

3.The Superintending Engineer,
Highways Department, Construction and Maintenance,
Tirunelveli.

4.Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Construction and Maintenance,
Virudhunagar.

5.Assistant Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Construction and Maintenance,
Srivilliputhur.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records connected with the impugned order passed by the second respondent in proceedings No.5344/Nir 1 (2)/2016 dated 12.10.2020 and quash the same and consequently, direct the second respondent to appoint the petitioner on compassionate grounds in the Highways Department in a suitable post.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rengaramanujam
For Respondents : Mr.D.S.Nedunchezian,
Government Advocate.

ORDER

The order of rejection, rejecting the claim of the writ petitioner for compassionate appointment in the proceedings dated 12.10.2020, is under challenge in the present Writ Petition.



2.The father of the writ petitioner, namely, K.Rajaguru was employed as Road Inspector and died in harness on 23.12.2006.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner made a submission that the brother of the writ petitioner initially submitted an application, seeking appointment on compassionate ground on 05.05.2007 and the said application was processed and the brother of the petitioner has also submitted his original certificates. When the application was in progress, the appointment order was not issued. However, the brother of the petitioner wanted to pursue his education and accordingly, not insisted for appointment on time.

4.With reference to the above submission, the learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents, relying the order impugned has stated that no doubt, the brother of the writ petitioner has submitted an application on 05.05.2007. However, he has given a letter on 15.09.2010 for withdrawal of the application and for return of all the original certificates and all those original certificates were returned on condition that he will not seek any appointment on compassionate ground. However, the writ petitioner / daughter of the deceased employee has submitted an application on 27.07.2012, which was rejected on the ground that three years period expired from the date of death of the deceased employee.

5.This Court is of the considered opinion that the brother, who submitted the application, was not interested in pursuing the employment. Contrarily, he has submitted a letter, stating that he will not submit any application for compassionate appointment in future and get back his original certificates handed over to the department. Under those circumstances, the other legal heirs are not eligible for appointment.

6.The contention of the petitioner that earlier application submitted by the brother of the petitioner is to be considered as a continuous cause, cannot be accepted, as the scheme of compassionate appointment is an exception and concession, not a right. Therefore, once the legal heir submitted application and that application is not pursued and withdrawn, the next legal heir cannot submit application for employment. It is not as if one appointment is provided to the family of the deceased.

7.Even recently, the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of ***State of Uttar Pradesh and Others vs. Premlata***, reported in ***(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 v. 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 Karnataka [(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 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



WEB COPY

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 v. 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.This being the scope of the scheme, this Court do not find any infirmity or perversity in respect of the order of the second respondent. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Myr



To

1.The Principal Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Highways Department,
Fort St.George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Director General,
Integrated Chief Engineer's Office,
HRS Campus, 76, Sardar Patel Road,
Guindy, Chennai-600 025.

3.The Superintending Engineer,
Highways Department, Construction and Maintenance,
Tirunelveli.

4.Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Construction and Maintenance,
Virudhunagar.

5.Assistant Divisional Engineer,
Highways Department,
Construction and Maintenance,
Srivilliputhur.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-8966[F] dated 28/02/2022)

W.P. (MD) No.765 of 2021

25.02.2022

SK(CO)

GC(09.03.2022) 6P 7C