

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.12364 of 2012

=====

Rambha Devi W/O Late Anand Kumar Sah and Daughter-In-Law Of Late Jyotish Prasad Sah R/O Village and Post-Haldikhoda, P.S.-Kochadhaman, District-Kishanganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. The Principal Secretary Revenue And Land Reforms Department, Bihar, Patna
3. The Director, Consolidation, Bihar, Patna
4. The Director, Land Records and Survey, Bihar, Patna
5. The District Magistrate Cum Chairman District Compassionate Committee, Araria
6. The Deputy Director, Consolidation, Purnia
7. The Settlement Officer, Saharsa
8. The Consolidaton Officer, Kursakanta Araria

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No. 1, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prem Ranjan Raj, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-01-2024 Heard Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Prem Ranjan Raj, learned counsel for the State.

2. The present writ application has been filed for direction upon the respondents to make appointment to the petitioner on compassionate ground and also to quash the decision of District Compassionate Committee, Araria dated 02.02.2011 contained in memo No. 233 dated 25.02.2011 by which the application of the petitioner has been rejected for compassionate appointment on the ground that he has been



submitted after about 16 years of the death of the original employee, who is father-in-law of the petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the State submits that earlier the son of the original employee filed an application for appointment on the compassionate ground and after the proposal of the District Compassionate Committee, his appointment was considered in the meeting dated 07.02.1997 in place of original employee, late Jyotish Prasad Sah but unfortunately, son of the original employee, Sri Anand Kumar Sah also died in the year 2003 itself and thereafter the petitioner who is wife of son of the original employee has filed application for the appointment on the compassionate ground in the year 2006 but the same was rejected on the ground that she has approached the authority after 16 years of the death of the original employee, which is against the mandate of the compassionate appointment.

4. Learned counsel for the State has filed a counter affidavit stating therein that after the death of son of the original employee, the petitioner has filed application for her appointment on the compassionate ground and the same was placed in the meeting of the compassionate appointment committee on 02.02.2011 and after due scrutiny and considering the law prescribed for the appointment on compassionate ground, case of the petitioner has been rejected vide Anenxure-17 declaring the case of the petitioner beyond the stipulated



period. Hence, the present case does not warrant interference of this Court.

5. In view of the aforesaid and also the stand of the State in the counter affidavit, this writ Court does not find force in the submission advanced on behalf of the petitioner. Accordingly, the writ petition being devoid of merit stands dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

brajesh/-

U			
---	--	--	--

