

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11319 of 2025

Ranvir Kumar Paswan son of Late Ghuran Paswan, resident of village/Mohalla- Ward No.11 Jalalpur Bengari, P.O.- Bhatta, P.S.- Pupri, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Additional Secretary, Home Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi.
5. The Sub-divisional Officer, Pupri, District- Sitamarhi.
6. The Sub-divisional Police Officer (S.D.P.O.), Sitamarhi.
7. The Officer-in-Charge, Police Station-Pupri, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Namrata Duvey, Advocate
Mr. Kumar Kaushik, Advocate
Mr. Hemant Raj, Advocate
Mr. Pranav Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Dr. Md. Raisul Haque, SC-10

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 24-07-2025

Heard Learned Counsel for the petitioner and

Learned Counsel for the State.

2. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner for quashing the minutes of the meeting of Screening Committee held on 07.02.2025 under the



Chairmanship of District Magistrate, Sitamarhi, by which the prayer for appointment on compassionate ground has been rejected.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the application of the petitioner for compassionate appointment has not been considered on the ground that the application has been filed with delay.

4. Learned Counsel for the State has raised preliminary objection and submits that the Counsel for the petitioner has made wrong submissions to the Court as the report of the Compassionate Committee indicates that the rejection of the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment has not been made due to delay; rather it has been rejected on the ground that one of the son of the deceased employee was already in service.

5. Upon perusal of Annexure-P/3 which is under challenge. It transpires that contention of the Counsel for the State is absolutely right. It is indicated that the one of the son of the deceased employee is in employment gainfully and on this ground the compassionate appointment has been rejected.



6. In this view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere in this matter. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.07.2025
Transmission Date	

