

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.2115 of 2025

Chandan Kumar Singh Son of- Late Anil Kumar Singh, Resident of Village-
Harail, Post- Harail, P.S. Mohiuddin Nagar, District- Samastipur, Bihar, Pin
No.-848501.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Home Department, Bihar, Patna.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
4. The District Magistrate, Jamui.
5. The Assistant Inspector General of Police (Welfare), Bihar, Patna
6. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Munger Division, Munger
7. The Superintendant of Police, Jamui.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Anuj Kumar, Adv. Mr.Arun Kumar Prasad, Adv. Mr.Sanjay Kumar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Raghwendra Kumar, SC-22

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL
ORAL ORDER

2 10-02-2025 Heard.

2. This is second round of litigation. This is a matter of compassionate appointment.

3. Petitioner claims for compassionate appointment on account of death of his father in harness as Assistant Sub Inspector of Police on 06.11.2018. After his death the petitioner made an application for grant of compassionate appointment which has been initially rejected vide order dated 06.04.2020 (Annexure 'P/3') on the ground that his brother



Kundan Kumar is a government servant, therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to get any appointment on compassionate ground the said order of rejection has been assailed by the petitioner before this Court being C.W.J.C. No. 1108 of 2020. The said petition has been disposed of by this Court on 16.11.2022 directing the concerned respondent/ authority to reconsider the claim of the petitioner in light of the judgment passed in ***C.W.J.C. No. 8149/2018 (Sittu Kumar vs. The State of Bihar and Ors.)*** and other judgments as referred in the said order dated 16.11.2022. Now the claim of the petitioner has been again rejected vide impugned order dated 28.02.2024 (Annexure 'P/8') on the same ground.

4. Perusal of the impugned order clearly shows that while deciding the matter of the petitioner the authority has not considered the judgment passed by this Court in case of ***Sittu Kumar*** (supra) and passed the order. Therefore, on this ground alone the impugned order is liable to and is hereby quashed. The concerned respondent is directed to reconsider the claim of the petitioner afresh and pass a reasoned order in light of judgment passed by this Court in case of ***Sittu Kumar*** (supra). Needless to say that the order will be passed by the concerned authority within 45 days from the date of receipt of



a copy of this order.

5. This petition is, accordingly, disposed of.

(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)

tusharika/-

U			
---	--	--	--

