

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Special Civil Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Judgment (2)
Moumita
Daily List Item No. 8

Present :
The Hon'ble Justice Aniruddha Roy

WPA 17305 of 2025

Nadirah Kamal
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Petitioner : **Mr. Subhra Prakash Lahiri**
Md. Habibur Rahman
Mr. Ankan Mondal

For the State/Respondent : **Mr. Pinaki Dhole, Ld. Adv.**
Mr. Sankar Halder

Heard on : **27.08.2025**

Judgment on : **27.08.2025**

Aniruddha Roy, J.:

1. Affidavit-of-service, filed in Court today, is taken on record.
2. Mr. Subhra Prakash Lahiri, learned counsel appears for the petitioner.
3. Mr. Sankar Halder, learned counsel led by Mr. Pinaki Dhole, learned State counsel appears for the State.
4. The father of the petitioner was a Junior Librarian Attendant (J.L.A.) at the District Library Office, Uttar Dinajpur. The father died on **March 5, 2006**. Thereafter, the mother of the petitioner being the widow of the deceased employee had received compassionate appointment **in 2010**. The mother of the petitioner then died on **May 24, 2024** while in employment.

The petitioner then on **June 5, 2025** applied for compassionate appointment.

5. Learned state counsel submits that repeated compassionate appointment is not permitted under the relevant policy for compassionate appointment governing the field.

6. After considering the rival contentions of the parties and on perusal of the materials on records, at the threshold, this court reiterates the law already settled on compassionate appointment. Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right. Unless the particular policy provides for the same there will be no compassionate appointment. By way of compassionate appointment, employment cannot be generated neither employment can be distributed.

7. In the facts of this case, if the compassionate appointment is granted to the petitioner, it would amount to distribution of employment generation-wise for a family and the family through its few generations would survive on compassionate appointment. This is not the law, neither is permitted in law.

8. In view of the above, this writ petition is devoid of any merit.

9. Accordingly, **WPA 17305 of 2025** stands **dismissed**, without any order as to costs.

(Aniruddha Roy, J.)