



WEB COPY



Review Application No.69 of 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.07.2024

CORAM:

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

Review Application No.69 of 2015
against
W.A.No.2441 of 2012

E.Ekambaram

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Engineer In Chief (WRD)
And The Chief Engineer (General),
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

2. The Chief Engineer (WRD),
Design Research & Construction Support
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

3. The Superintending Engineer/Director,
Institute Of Hydraulics And Hydrology,
Poondi Village,
Tiruvallur Taluk & District.

4. The Deputy Director,
Institute Of Hydraulics & Hydrology Poondi Village,
Tiruvallur Taluk And District.

... Respondents



Review Application No.69 of 2015

PRAYER: Review Application filed under Order 47 Rule 1 read with Section 114 of C.P.C. praying to review the order dated 22.01.2015 made in W.A.No.2441 of 2012 and dismiss the writ appeal.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Muthappan

For Respondents : Mr.T.Chezhiyan,
Additional Government Pleader.

ORDER

(Judgement of the Court was delivered by S.M.Subramaniam J.)

The order dated 22.01.2015 in Writ Appeal No.2441 of 2012 is sought to be reviewed in the present review application.

2. Mr.M.Muthappan, learned counsel for the review petitioner would submit that the brother of the petitioner, though employed in Government services, is living separately and not supported the family of the deceased employee. Therefore, the other legal heir is eligible to seek compassionate appointment under the scheme.



Review Application No.69 of 2015

WEB COPY

3. As per the terms and conditions of the scheme of compassionate appointment, if any one of the member of the family is already in government service, the family of the deceased employee is not eligible to avail the benefit of the scheme of compassionate appointment. That being the terms, the authorities have rightly rejected the application for compassionate appointment, which is affirmed in the order sought to be reviewed.

4. The petitioner could not able to point out any error apparent for interference and therefore, the review application stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

(S.M.S.J.,)

(C.K.J.,)

10.07.2024

Index : Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-Speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

(sha)



Review Application No.69 of 2015

To

1. The Engineer In Chief (WRD)
And The Chief Engineer (General),
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.
2. The Chief Engineer (WRD),
Design Research & Construction Support
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.
3. The Superintending Engineer/Director,
Institute Of Hydraulics And Hydrology,
Poondi Village,
Tiruvallur Taluk & District.
4. The Deputy Director,
Institute Of Hydraulics & Hydrology Poondi Village,
Tiruvallur Taluk And District.



WEB COPY



Review Application No.69 of 2015

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

and

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

(sha)

Review Application No.69 of 2015

against

W.A.No.2441 of 2012

10.07.2024