

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16675 of 2024

=====

Rahul Kumar Singh, Son of Late Ajay Singh, resident of Laxmi Nagar, Banu Chhapra, P.S.-Bettiah, District-West Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, General Administration Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Collector cum District Magistrate, West Champaran, Bettiah.
5. The Deputy Collector (Establishment), West Champaran, Bettiah.
6. Deputy Development Commissioner, West Champaran, Bettiah.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, Advocate
		Mr. Hemant Ray, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Rewati Kant Raman, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 29-10-2024 Heard Mr. Umesh Chandra Verma, learned Advocate

for the petitioner and Mr. Rewati Kant Raman, learned

Advocate for the State.

2. The petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this

Court seeking a direction upon the respondent authorities to

appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground on any of the

suitable post by virtue of the death of his father, who died in

harness on 15.10.2021 while working as a jeep driver in the



office of Deputy Development Officer, Bettiah.

3. At the outset, learned Advocate for the State made a preliminary objection and submitted that the claim of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate ground has already been turned down by the District Compassionate Committee in its meeting dated 09.10.2023, taking note of the fact that the father of the petitioner was working in a District Rural Development Agency, which is a society registered under the Societies Registration Act.

4. In terms of the guideline, regulating the affairs of the DRDA, there is no provision for regular appointment. The employment, if any, is being made on contractual basis. It is also clarified that under the afore-noted guidelines, there is no provision for compassionate appointment.

5. This Court *prima facie* finds substance in the submission of the learned Advocate for the State, moreover, in absence of any statutory rules, executive instruction or the Scheme for appointment on compassionate ground, the claim of any of the dependent of a deceased employee who died in harness, is, *per se*, not maintainable. All the more, the impugned decision taken by the District Compassionate Committee has not been put to challenge before this Court.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts, this Court does not



find any merit in the writ petition, accordingly the same stands
dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

supratim/-

U			
---	--	--	--

