

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1287 of 2018

=====

Suman Devi W/o Late Rajendra Ravidas, Village-Manorah, P.O. Punpun,
P.S.Punpun, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union Of India through the Principal Secretary Finance Department,
Government of India, New Delhi
2. The Zonal Manager, Central Bank of India, Zonal Office 2nd Floor, 'B'
Block, Maurya Lok Complex, Patna-800001
3. Branch Manager, Central Bank of India, Gauri Chowk, Village-Gauri
Chowk, P.S. Fatehpur, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shambhu Sharan Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dr. K.N. Singh, Addl. Soc. Gen.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

7 12-09-2023 Heard the parties.

2. This application has been filed for issuance of appropriate writ, order or direction to the Bank-respondents to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground as her husband who was serving in the Central Bank of India had died in harness on 20.10.2013 leaving behind his wife (petitioner) and five minor childrens who are facing all hardship of livelihood due to lack of money.

3. A counter affidavit on behalf of the respondent-Central Bank of India is on record. As per it there is/was no scheme of compassionate appointment in the Bank and instead



the scheme of payment of ex-gratia lump sum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate ground has been made applicable as per the scheme dated 16.06.2006 of the Central Bank of India.

4. A bare perusal of the said annexure are/were shown that it has been specifically captioned as scheme for payment of ex-gratia lump sum amount in lieu of appointment on compassionate ground. The further stand of the Bank is that all the payments have been made to the lady and she is also getting her family pension regularly.

5. In view of the said un-rebutted statement/annexure of the Central Bank of India, when the scheme of compassionate appointment itself is not in the Bank, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. It is the case of the petitioner that ignoring the said scheme, to her knowledge some of the dependents of the employees have been extended the compassionate appointment benefit.

6. The vague statement made has no meaning. If the petitioner has relevant documents to prove, armed with the same, she can approach the Bank who will be then duty bound to act and/or pass an order.

7. It is expected that the scheme that the Bank has



envisaged is extended to this petitioner also.

8. The writ petition stands disposed of.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

Mkr./-

U			
---	--	--	--

