

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8608 of 2019

=====

Amarjeet Kumar Son of Late Jairam Singh R/o Village-Dumari Bujurg, P.S.-
Nayagaon, District-Saran at Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The District Magistrate Madhepura
3. The National Highway Authority of India
4. The Union of India

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Bindyachal Singh, Sr. Advocate Mrs. Smirti Singh, Advocate Mr. Vipin Kumar Singh, Advocate Mr. J. Girdhar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Suman Kumar Jha, AC to AAG-3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

3 21-09-2023 Heard learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and

the State.

2. This application has been filed for the following
reliefs:

*(i) for issuance of writ in the nature of
certiorari for quashing of the part of the
proceeding of meeting of the District
Compassionate Committee dated 11.06.2018 under
the Chairmanship of the District Magistrate- cum-
Chairman, District Compassionate Committee and
communicated to the petitioner vide letter no. 950
dated 09.07.2018 whereby the case of the
petitioner for compassionate appointment has been*



rejected;

(ii) for issuance of the writ in the nature of mandamus for commanding the respondents to appoint the petitioner on any suitable class III post by taking into consideration his educational qualification in the background of the fact that the father of the petitioner died leaving behind the widow (mother of the petitioner), the petitioner (unemployed), one minor brother of the petitioner and two sisters including one minor as well as two elder brothers of the petitioner though employed in the Indian Air Force but living separately from the life time of the father of the petitioner;

(iii) for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ for holding that the impugned order passed in the proceeding of the meeting of the District Compassionate Meeting, Madhepura held on 11.06.2018 with respect to the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable as the claim for compassionate appointment of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that his two elder brothers are working in the Indian Air Force without considering the relevant aspect that they have been living separately from the life time of the father and no taking the care of widow/mother or the petitioner or his minor brothers and sisters;

(iv) For holding that the petitioner is entitled to be appointed on compassionate ground as he has moved and application for appointment



before the respondent authority after the death of his father in harness and he has no source of income for livelihood.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that it will suffice if liberty is given to agitate his grievance before the appropriate authority.

4. The writ application stands disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Jagdish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

