



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 25.04.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE BATTU DEVANAND

W.P.(MD) No.8989 of 2025

Hari Siva Narayanan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director General of Police,
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
No.1, Dr.Radakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai 04.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul Distrcit,
Dindigul.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent herein in Na.Ka.No.A9/25685/328/2023 dated 09.05.2024 and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the Respondents to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground to any eligible post in the respondents department.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sarvagan Prabhu

For Respondents : Mr.D.Sachikumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the records.

2.Admittedly, the father of the petitioner, who worked as Assistant in the Office of Superintendent of Police, Dindigul, died on 06.11.2014 in harness leaving behind the petitioner, his mother and elder sister as legal heirs. At the time of death of his father, the petitioner was aged about 9 years and his sister was aged about 11 years.

3.In such circumstances, the mother of the petitioner made a representation on 04.07.2017 to the respondents to provide employment to any one of her children after attaining the age of majority under compassionate ground. The first respondent on 17.10.2017 sent a communication to the second respondent to initiate necessary action in this regard. A copy of the said communication has also been marked to the mother of the petitioner. After receiving the said communication, the mother of the petitioner approached the




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

second respondent on several occasions. Even till date, no response from the

second respondent. In the meantime, the petitioner attained the age of majority and thereafter, he submitted a representation on 04.09.2023 to the respondents with reference to the communication of the first respondent, dated 17.10.2017, requesting to provide employment in the Department of Police on compassionate ground. The said representation was not considered.

4. Therefore, the petitioner approached this Court by filing W.P.(MD) No. 6037 of 2024. This Court, by order dated 13.03.2024, directed the respondents therein to consider the application of the petitioner within a period of 12 weeks in accordance with law. Pursuant to the same, the second respondent passed an order on 09.05.2024 rejecting the request of the petitioner. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition is filed.

5. The reason stated in the impugned order to reject the claim of the petitioner is that at the time of death of his father, the petitioner did not attain the age of 18 years and the petitioner submitted the application beyond three years from the date of death of his father.



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

6.The issue involved in the present writ petition was already dealt by this

WEB COPY Court and the Court of Andhra Pradesh and Apex Court in the following judgments:

i) A Division Bench of Madurai Bench of Madras High Court while dealing with a case in similar circumstances in [P.Kasthuri vs. The Chief Engineer \(Personnel\) and another](#) in W.A.(MD).No.792 of 2011 vide its judgment dated 03.12.2015 directed the respondents therein to make compassionate appointment to the appellant therein considering the application submitted within the stipulated time by the mother of the appellant. The relevant paragraphs of [the said judgment](#) are extracted hereunder:

“7.One more aspect which has to be considered de hors of the Rules is the pathetic condition of the appellant and other children of late Palanivel. After the death of the said Palanivel in 1994, his wife also passed away on 04.08.1996 after applying for compassionate appointment. In fact, the appellant and others have become orphans and they are looked after by their maternal uncle. When such is the pitiable condition, the respondents should have considered the appellant's application for compassionate appointment with compassion.




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

8.The learned Single Judge should also have taken into consideration the said aspect. The learned Single Judge, in fact, did not take into consideration the application made by the appellant's mother on 11.01.1996 for compassionate appointment which was in time. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the second respondent as well as the order of the learned Single Judge are set aside. The respondents are directed to make the compassionate appointment of the appellant on or before 01.04.2016, failing which the respondents shall appear before this Court on 02.04.2016.”

ii) In *S.Velraj vs. The Superintendent Engineer and another* in W.A. (MD).No.1400 of 2011, a Division Bench of this Court vide its judgment dated 16.12.2015 held that three years limitation cannot be applied in strait-jacket formula and each and every case has to be approached differently, based on the facts. The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:

“3.It is admitted fact that the employee died on 19.03.1992, leaving behind four children and at that time, the appellant is the eldest son, aged about 12 years. If he applied for



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

appointment on compassionate ground at that time, when he was 12 years, his application would have been rejected on the ground that he was a minor and, therefore, on attaining majority, the appellant rightly applied for appointment on compassionate ground. However, taking into consideration the plight of the family and also the young age of the mother and other children, it is a case where appointment on compassionate ground has to be given. Three years limitation cannot be applied in strait-jacket formula and each and every case has to be approached differently, based on the facts. Since the eldest son of the family has rightly applied for appointment on compassionate ground, on attaining majority, the respondents have to consider the appellant's application for appointment on compassionate ground.”

iii) In **Priyadharshini vs. The Registrar General, High Court, Madras** in WP.No.28945 of 2019, a Division Bench of this Court vide its judgment dated 25.11.2019 held that the respondents therein failed to consider the indigent circumstances of the petitioner therein and held that 3 years limitation period




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

cannot be cited as a straight-jacket formula for rejecting the claim of the petitioner. The relevant paragraphs of the said order are extracted hereunder:

“8.We find from a perusal of the impugned order that the respondent has failed to consider the indigent circumstances of the petitioner. The application of the petitioner seeking appointment on compassionate grounds, was rejected mainly on the ground that she was minor and the application was not submitted within three years from the date of the death of her father. We find that she has submitted the application six months prior to her attaining majority. Therefore, within a reasonable time, she has submitted the application and after attaining majority, she has also made a representation, dated 06.03.2019.

9.In similar circumstances, this Court (Madurai Bench) in W.A. (MD).No.1400 of 2011 (S.Velraj Vs. The Superintendent Engineer, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, Tirunelveli Electricity Distribution Circle, Tirunelveli), by order dated 16.12.2015 and in another judgment of this Court (Madurai Bench) reported in 2016 (5) CTC 125 ([The Inspector General of Prisons Vs. P.Marimuthu](#)), observed that the appointment on compassionate grounds had to be given considering



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

the facts and circumstances of each case and therefore, the three-year limitation period cannot be applied as a straight-jacket formula and each and every case has to be approached differently based on the facts.

10. In the instant case, the factual aspects of the matter show that the petitioner has become orphan and her grandfather, under whom she is in the custody, is an age-old person and that the petitioner has also produced necessary documents to show that she has no sufficient funds to sustain herself.

11. Considering all the above aspects, we are of the opinion that this is a fit case to quash the impugned order. Accordingly, the impugned order is quashed. The Writ Petition is allowed as prayed for. The respondent is directed to give suitable employment to the petitioner commensurate with her educational qualification on compassionate grounds. No costs.”

iv) In *The District Collector and 2 others vs. S.Santhi* in W.A.No.2640 of 2018, a Division Bench of this Court vide its judgment dated 30.01.2023 held as follows:




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

“5. We are alive to the fact that application for compassionate appointment should be made within a reasonable time, in the case on hand the application was made within a year, but due to certain circumstances the nominee was changed. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be blamed for the delay. In similar circumstances, where the elder son of the Government servant died and an application was made after six years nominating the younger son, a Division Bench of this Court in [M.Namadeva v. The Director](#) or School Education, made in WA No.4062 of 2019 dated 26.11.2019, had held that in such cases delay cannot be a ground to refuse compassionate appointment.”

v) In [A.Chindamani vs. The General Manager and another](#) in W.P.No. 31311 of 2017, a learned Single Judge of this Court vide order dated 25.08.2021 held as follows:


“8. This is a case where the petitioner herself appears to be an uneducated and a semi-literate person. It is not expected for an uneducated homemaker to be aware of the Government orders, which are released from time to time, by the Government. Considering the fact



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

that the petitioner's son was a minor at the time of the death of his father and also the fact that there was no other guideline which was uniformly being applied at the time of the death of the petitioner's husband, this Court is inclined to direct the respondent/Board to consider the petitioner's application for appointment on compassionate ground of her son, favourably by overlooking the three year limitation prescribed in G.O.Ms.No.120, Labour and Employment Department dated 26.06.1995. The respondent/Board may also consider the fact that several other persons who had applied after the petitioner's application were appointed after the limitation period of three years prescribed in G.O.Ms.No.120, Labour and Employment Department dated 26.06.1995 had expired and by relaxing the same by applying G.O.Ms.No.18, Labour and Employment (Q1) Department dated 23.01.2020 which is currently prevailing for employment on compassionate grounds. The respondent/Board shall dispose of the application of the petitioner favourably, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order provided the petitioner satisfies the other criteria for appointment on compassionate ground."



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

vi) While considering the identical facts in a case in ***K.Michael Johnson***

vs. A.P.Southern Power Distribution Company Limited reported in (2021) 2


ALD 43, the High Court of Andhra Pradesh directed the respondents therein to consider the claim of the petitioner to appoint him in a suitable post within a period of six months. The relevant paragraphs of the said order is extracted hereunder:

“20.Thus, such cases in which unfledged children lose their parents in harness have to be considered as “hard cases” and should be dealt with a humane outlook and thoughtfulness.

.....

....

23.In identical matters, the Hon’ble High Court of Madras following the decisions of the Hon’ble Apex Court in (1) T. Meer 5 (2007) 6 MLJ 1011 2021:[APHC:1202 12 Ismail Ali Vs. The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and others](#), (2) [Selvi R. Anbarasi Vs. The Chief Engineer \(Personnel\), Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and others](#) (3) [The Superintending Engineer vs. V. Jaya](#) and (4) [M. Uma Vs. The Chief Engineer \(Personnel\), Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and others](#) and (5) J. Jeba Mary’s case wherein directed the respondent authority therein i.e.,



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

Tamil Nadu Electricity Board to issue an order of appointment on compassionate grounds to the petitioners therein as per their qualifications.

24. In the present case, this Court already noted that the guardian of the petitioner made an application, dated 05.06.2003 within the stipulated period in favour of the petitioner, being a minor at that time and after attaining the age of 18 years she made another application on 14.11.2013 seeking appointment on compassionate grounds to the petitioner. Though this Court is having conscious of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court on which the respondents relied in their counter, in view of the provision provided in the Board proceedings delegating the powers to relax the conditions to the Member Secretary of the APSEB and 6 2004 (3) CTC 120 7 (2006) 2 MLJ 200 8 (2007) 6 MLJ 1011 9 (2010) 7 MLJ 644 2021:APHC:1202 13 of the fact that the guardian of the petitioner has made an application within the stipulated time and also made subsequent application after attaining the age of majority by the petitioner and also taking note of the fact that the petitioner, who turned an orphan due to his father's death in harness, the claim of the petitioner has to be considered."




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

vii) In similar circumstances, a Division Bench of this Court in ***The State of Tamil Nadu, Rep. by its Secretary vs. C.Arnold***, in WA(MD).No.479 of 2024, dated 01.04.2024, directed the appellants therein to provide compassionate appointment to the respondent therein within a period of 2 months. The relevant paragraphs are extracted hereunder:

“13. Therefore, it is not mandatory that at the time of making the application seeking compassionate appointment, the applicant or for whom such an application has been made seeking compassionate appointment to have a minimum years of age, that means on behalf of a minor also the application can be made, however, such application even if it is considered, the appointment can be given to the dependant or legal heir only after he or she attains majority.

14. Therefore, the intention of the Rule making authority is clear, unambiguous and explicit to state that under no circumstances compassionate appointment should be denied to a family which is in penurious circumstances where for want of attaining the majority of the legal heir or dependant of the deceased employees family, if compassionate appointment could not be given immediately, the



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COM

employer can consider such application and grant the same or extend the benefit of compassionate appointment to such a dependant or legal heir of the deceased employee of the family on his attaining the majority.

15. When this intention of the Government has been made very clear under the Rule and the Rule has also been given to force with effect from 08.03.2023, thereafter, if the consideration is made in May 2023, in the case in hand, the Rule should have been applied and had it been applied, the application filed on behalf of the respondent/writ petitioner ought not to have been rejected by the employer. Therefore, the learned Judge since has interfered with the said order and given direction in the order impugned to consider the application for extending the benefit of compassionate appointment to the respondent/writ petitioner, in our considered view it is flawless and hence, the same is to be sustained. Accordingly, the impugned order is sustained. Hence, the Writ Appeal fails.”

viii) While dealing with a writ petition in WP.No.30954 of 2018 (*M.Swetha vs. The District Collector and 3 others*), filed in similar



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

circumstances, this Court by its order dated 06.11.2024 observed as hereunder:

WEB COPY “7.The aim and object of providing compassionate appointment is to give immediate support to the family who lost their breadwinner who died over the sudden crises. For effective implementation of the compassionate appointment scheme, the State Government issued several instructions and order time to time. In several cases, it came to the notice of the Court that the respondents are maintaining the seniority list, district wise to provide compassionate appointment to the eligible legal heirs of the deceased employees who died in harness. In most of the cases, the State Government is taking more than 10 to 15 years to provide compassionate appointment by following the seniority list maintained by them.

8.Under these factual position, the ground raised by the respondents in the impugned order that the petitioner submitted her application for compassionate appointment after three years of the death of the petitioner's father is, untenable and unsustainable. As and when the State Government is not in a position to provide compassionate appointment immediately after demise of the breadwinner of the family or at a reasonable time, they are not suppose



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

*to contend that the petition submitted after three years by the petitioner
and as such, she is not entitled for consideration."*

7.The learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents in support of his contention has placed a reliance on the order dated 12.06.2024 in WP.No.23314 of 2023 of a learned Single Judge of this Court. On going through the said order, this Court is of the opinion that the said order is not applicable to the facts of the present case.

8.The principle behind the compassionate appointment is to provide a buffer, a cushion to the direct dependants of the deceased employee to cope with the loss. The purpose of providing compassionate appointment to the members of the deceased government servant is to render assistance to the family, which is found in indigent circumstances. The respondents are not supposed to defeat the claim of the dependants of the deceased family on technicalities or on the ground that the application was made beyond the stipulated time of 3 years. The respondents ought to have adopt a humane touch while considering the claim of the dependants of the deceased family for compassionate appointment.




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

9.It is appropriate to extract the observation of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh in [K.Udaykiran vs. State of Andhra Pradesh](#) reported in 2021 SCC OnLine AP 2009 at Paragraph Nos.15 and 20 as hereunder:

“15. The respondents have to understand the very purpose of providing compassionate appointment, which is meant for providing employment assistance to the dependants of the deceased employee, who died in harness and thereby to provide some relief to the family from undergoing financial sufferings. When the family of the deceased employee consisting of illiterate wife and minor child, since, they have no other source of livelihood after the untimely death of the bread winner of the family, the respondents should have been much more sympathetic and practical in considering the claim of the dependants of the deceased employee for compassionate appointment.

20.This Court expects from the respondents also such type of liberal approach in considering the claims of the dependants of the deceased employees for compassionate appointments. This court holds that the respondents shall consider the cases of the dependants of the employees died in harness with human touch without considering only



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

technicalities.”


WEB COPY

10. In this regard, it is worthwhile to refer the case in ***Balbir Kaur v. Steel Authority of India Limited*** reported in (2000) 6 SCC 493 wherein their Lordships (U.C. Benarjee, J speaking for the Bench) of the Hon'ble Supreme Court have held as under:

“In the case of appointment considering the social and economic justice as enshrined in the constitution, denials of deserving cases are liable to be set aside. Further, the purpose of providing compassionate ground to a son or daughter or a near relative of the deceased government servant is to render assistance to the family, which is found in indigenous circumstances. Hence, in considering the case for compassionate appointment, the authorities are supposed to adopt a human outlook.”

11. The Hon-ble Apex [Court further held](#) at Para No. 19 as extracted hereunder:

“The concept of social justice is the yardstick to the justice administration system or the legal justice and as Respondent pointed




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

out that the greatest virtue of law is in its adaptability and flexibility and thus it would be otherwise an obligation for the law courts also to apply the law depending upon the situation since the law is made for the society and whichever is beneficial for the society, the endeavour of the law court would be to administer justice having due regard in that direction.”

12. In this regard, it is worthwhile to refer the case in [Superintending Engineer v. V. Jaya](#) reported in (2007) 6 Mad LJ 1011, wherein their Lordships comprising a Division Bench of this Court have held at Para No. 7 as extracted hereunder:

“7. However, in a case of request for appointment on compassionate ground, however, the Court, while exercising its jurisdiction under [Article 226](#) of the Constitution of India, cannot ignore the very purpose of providing employment on compassionate ground to the dependant of an employee/government servant dying in harness in preference to anybody else as it is done so in order to mitigate the hardship to the family of the employee on account of his unexpected death while still in service. The concept of compassionate




W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

employment is intended to alleviate the distress of the family and it is for such purpose appointments are permissible and provided even in the rules and regulations and any rigid approach or too technical objections may defeat the very object of the scheme. It is for that purpose while considering the request for compassionate appointment; the authorities are expected to act as a Good Samaritan overlooking the cobwebs of technicalities.”

13. In the present case, admittedly, the mother of the petitioner made a representation seeking for compassionate appointment 04.07.2017. After attaining majority, the petitioner made a representation dated 04.09.2023 for compassionate appointment. These facts are squarely covered in the order of the Division Bench of Madras High Court in *P.Kasthuri vs. The Chief Engineer. (Personnel) and another* (stated supra). As such, the representation submitted by the mother of the petitioner is within the time and the representation submitted by the petitioner is a consequential one and therefore, there is no substance in the contention of the respondents for rejecting the claim of the petitioner on the ground of delay.



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

WEB COPY

14. For the aforesaid reasons and in the light of the settled position of law stated supra, the present Writ Petition is allowed and the order passed by the second respondent in Na.Ka.No.A9/25685/328/2023 dated 09.05.2024 is hereby set aside with a consequential direction to the respondents to appoint the petitioner in any suitable post within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

NCC :yes/no
Index :yes/no
Internet :yes/no

25.04.2025

mm

To

1. The Director General of Police,
Tamil Nadu Police Department,
No.1, Dr.Radakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai 04.

2. The Superintendent of Police,
Dindigul District,
Dindigul.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

BATTU DEVANAND, J.

mm

W.P.(MD)No.8989 of 2025

25.04.2025