

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9673 of 2016

=====

Sweta Bharti daughter of Late Jagdish Singh Resident of Mohalla -
Harnichak, P.O. & P.S. Beur, District-Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. The Principal Secretary, Human Resources Department, Govt. of Bihar,
Patna.
3. The Director, Secondary Education, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Patna.
5. The District Education Officer, District- Patna.
6. The District Education Officer, District- Patna.
7. The District Programme Officer, Establishment, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anand Kishore Choudhary
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Suman Kumar Jha, AC to AAG 3

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

- 6 25-04-2024 1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned.
2. The petitioner is the married daughter of the deceased employee and is seeking compassionate appointment on the ground that the father of the petitioner died in harness on 10.08.2014 while working as Assistant Teacher.
3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that her father died leaving behind the petitioner, the petitioner's mother and her brother, the details of which are mentioned in Annexure 3 to the writ application.
4. Referring to Annexure 8 to the writ application, which is



circular, dated 10.12.2014, issued by the General Administration Department, Government of Bihar, saying therein that the married daughters of the deceased employee are also entitled for compassionate appointment, the petitioner applied for appointment just after the death of her father, on 10.09.2015, but the claim of the petitioner has not yet been decided.

5. On the other hand, learned Counsel for the State submits that the petitioner, being the married daughter of the deceased employee is not entitled for compassionate appointment as per the circular, dated 10.12.2014 inasmuch as the circular, in very uncertain terms, says that in case, there is only daughters of the deceased employee, then only married daughter can be considered for compassionate appointment.
6. Upon the own showing of the petitioner, at Annexure 3, the deceased employee died leaving behind his son, namely, Ravi Raushan, also.
7. Having heard learned Counsel for the parties concerned and taking into consideration the circular, dated 10.12.2014, and the fact that the deceased employee died leaving behind son and daughter both and the petitioner is



the married daughter of the deceased employee, I come to the conclusion that circular, dated 10.12.2014, is not applicable in the facts of the present case and the petitioner is not entitled for compassionate appointment.

8. This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J.)

Prabhakar Anand/-

U	√		
---	---	--	--

