

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6514 of 2019

Amrendra Kumar Pandey Son of Late Surendra Kumar Pandey, Village-Bishaul, P.O.- Sukhet, District- Madubani, Bihar, 847404.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State Power (Holding) Company Limited through its Chairman cum Managing Director, having its registered office at First Floor, Vidhut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Chairman cum Managing Director, Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Limited, having its registered office at First Floor, Vidhut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. North Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, through its Managing Director, having its registered office at Second Floor, Vidhut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
4. Chairman cum Managing Director, North Bihar Power (Holding) distribution Company Limited, Patna.
5. Deputy Managing Director, (HR/Adm.), North Bihar Power (Holding) distribution Company Limited, Patna.
6. General Manager cum Chief Engineer, North Bihar Power (Holding) distribution company Limited, Saharsa Division.
7. The General Manger, (HR/Adm.), North Bihar Power (Holding) distribution Company Limited, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Murari Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Prem Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Ratan Prasad Sinha, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 30-04-2025

Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction upon the respondent authorities to consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate ground against any of the suitable post.



3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner contended that the claim of the petitioner was duly considered by the North Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, however, on being found the petitioner crossed the maximum age for appointment under General Category, his claim for compassionate appointment came to be rejected.

4. Learned Advocate for the North Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited is present and submission has been made that the date on which the claim of the petitioner was considered, he had already attained the age of 41 years, though the maximum age for General Category is prescribed 37 years and, as such, in any view of the matter, there is no infirmity in the impugned order whereby the claim of the petitioner came to be rejected.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced on behalf of the learned Advocates for the respective parties, this Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order. Moreover, the father of the petitioner died on 12.12.2014 and the very object of the compassionate appointment is to give immediate succor to the bereft family whose bread earner died in harness. It is settled proposition that once it is proved that inspite of the death of breadwinner, the family survived and substantial period is



over, there is no need to make appointment on compassionate ground at the cost of others. This Court also finds substance that the date on which the claim of the petitioner was considered, he had already attained the age of 41 years. i.e., much above the maximum age limit prescribed for appointment under General Category, hence the writ petition *sans* any merit stands dismissed.

(Harish Kumar, J)

Anjani/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	01.05.2025
Transmission Date	

