



\$~88

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 114/2024 & CM APPL. 21105/2025**

MANISH TIWARI & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vijay Mishra, Advocate.

versus

AMIT YADAV, CHAIRPERSON, NDMC & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Nirvikar, ASC for NDMC/R-1.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with Mr. Tushar Sannu, ASC, Mr. Vikrmaditya Singh & Mr. Parvin Bansal, Advocates alongwith Ms. Anju Randhawa, JD/NSES and Mr. Vikash Mathur, AO NSES.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

20.08.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Sections 11/12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India has been filed seeking following prayers:-

“a) Initiate contempt proceedings against the Respondent for willfully and deliberately disobeying the order dated 24.07.2023 of this Hon'ble Court passed in the Writ Petition (Civil) 12030 of 2018.

b) Pass any other or further order/s as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. The present contempt petition was filed alleging the non-compliance of directions passed *vide* order dated 24.07.2023 in W.P.(C) 12030/2018. The following directions were passed:-



“6. The petitioner is directed to file a detailed representation/application along with the copy of the instant petition including the pleadings of the petition as well as the certified copy of this order before the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council within two weeks from today and after receiving the detailed representation/application, the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council is directed to dispose of the detailed representation/application keeping in the mind the contents of the petition as well as of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents after giving personal hearing to the petitioners, if required and pass a detailed and reasoned order in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within eight weeks.”

4. On 24.01.2024, learned Predecessor Bench of this Court, while issuing notice in the present petition, had observed as under:-

“4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for respondent/NDMC submits that the order dated 24th July, 2023 passed by this Court has already been complied with. He submits that a speaking order dated December, 2023 has already been issued, which is on record before this Court. He submits that as per the said speaking order, all matters of compassionate appointment pending in the Navyug School Education Society, which also includes the petitioners herein, will be considered and decided in a maximum time period of two months by following the due procedure. The said speaking order further states that the petitioners will continue to work as contractual employees with the Navyug School Education Society till then. Thus, he submits that there is no disobedience of the order dated 24th July, 2023 passed by this Court.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent further submits that since in the said speaking order, it has been stated that the requisite action with respect to the compassionate appointment of the petitioners shall be taken within a period of two months, the matter may be re-notified at a short date.”

5. Subsequently, *vide* judgment dated 10.05.2024 learned Predecessor Bench of this Court had disposed of this petition by observing as under:-

“6. Having heard learned counsels for the parties, this Court notes that by order dated 24th July, 2023 passed in W.P.(C) 12030/2018, the only



direction passed by the Coordinate Bench was to treat the petition of the petitioners as representation and the respondents were directed to pass a detailed and reasoned order with respect thereto.

7. Relevant portion of the order dated 24th July, 2023 passed in W.P.(C) 12030/2018, reads as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

6. The petitioner is directed to file a detailed representation/application along with the copy of the instant petition including the pleadings of the petition as well as the certified copy of this order before the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council within two weeks from today and after receiving the detailed representation/application, the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council is directed to dispose of the detailed representation/application keeping in the mind the contents of the petition as well as of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents after giving personal hearing to the petitioners, if required and pass a detailed and reasoned order in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within eight weeks.

xxx xxx xxx”

8. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the respondents have considered the case of the petitioners, which has culminated in a Speaking Order dated 05th December, 2023, relevant portion of which, reads as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

16. After due deliberation and discussion, the BoG has approved that “Compassionate appointment cases of Navyug School Educational Society (NSES) may be considered as per the extant compassionate appointment Policy/instructions issued by Department of Personnel and Training, Govt. of India.” 17. Accordingly, all the matters of compassionate appointment pending in Navyug School Educational Society (NSES), the cases including those of the petitioners, will be considered and decided in a maximum time period of 2 months by following the due procedure. The Petitioners will continue to work as contractual employees in NSES till then.

xxx xxx xxx”



9. Reading of the aforesaid order clearly shows that the respondents have already taken a policy decision that the case for compassionate appointment of the petitioners to the Navyug School Educational Society shall be considered and decided expeditiously by the respondents.

10. This Court also takes note of the order dated 29th February, 2024 passed in the present proceedings, wherein it has been recorded as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

6. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent points out that the speaking order dated 05th December, 2023 has already been passed in compliance of the order dated 24th July, 2023. He further submits that the process for filling up the posts on compassionate appointments in Navyug Schools has already been initiated.

7. He submits that the petitioners herein were issued a letter seeking to provide certain documents and to fill the format for the purposes of compassionate appointments. However, the petitioners have not been cooperating with the respondent. 8. In view of the aforesaid, it is directed that the petitioners shall cooperate with the respondents and provide all the requisite information and documents to the respondents. Further, the format which is to be filled for the purposes of compassionate appointments and other formalities which were required to be fulfilled, shall be complied by the petitioners.

9. Needless to state, the respondents shall expeditiously process the cases of the petitioners for compassionate appointments.
xxx xxx xxx”

11. This court also takes note of the submissions made by learned counsel for the respondents that the documents, for the purposes of compassionate appointment of the petitioners, have already been requisitioned and which have already been submitted by the petitioners with the respondents on 02nd March, 2024.

12. Thus, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the order dated 24th July, 2023, passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, is being complied with, by the



respondents in its true letter and spirit.

13. This Court also records the undertaking made by learned counsel for the respondents, on instructions, that the process of compassionate appointment of the petitioners shall be completed expeditiously. However, he submits that time of at least four months be granted from today, as considering the various formalities, the said process may take some time.

14. Accordingly, it is directed that the respondents shall complete the process of compassionate appointment of the petitioners expeditiously, preferably, within a period of four months from today.”

6. Subsequently, the respondent No.2/NSES filed an application, CM APPL. 54199/2024, seeking extension and grant of 8 weeks’ time to comply with the aforesaid judgment dated 10.05.2024 and the matter *vide* order dated 21.10.2024 was listed for hearing on 12.12.2024. The said application was disposed of by the learned Predecessor Bench of this Court *vide* order dated 12.12.2024 by observing as under:-

“1. Status report has been filed by the respondents. Copy thereof has also been supplied to the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for respondent, on instructions, submit that needful compliance shall be done in 12 weeks.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though there is no justifiable reason given in the status report in seeking more time, keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case and after taking requisite instructions from the petitioners, at the moment, the petitioners do not press the present petition.

4. However, it is submitted that respondents may be bound by the statement whereby they claim that the needful would be done within 12 weeks from today.

5. He also submits that in case, nothing happens even after expiry of



period of 12 weeks from today, the petitioners may be permitted to revive the present contempt petition.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of as not pressed. Simultaneously, liberty is granted to revive the petition, in case, situation so arises.

7. This Court, in view of indulgence granted to respondents time and again, expects that the situation would not come to the point whereby the petitioners are compelled to revive the present petition.”

7. Thereafter, CM APPL. 73306/2024 was filed on behalf of the respondent seeking time for compliance, however, since the main petition had already been disposed of *vide* the aforesaid judgment dated 10.05.2024, and the respondents were already granted four (4) weeks time *vide* order dated 21.10.2024. The application was disposed of *vide* order dated 13.12.2024.

8. Thereafter, another application, CM APPL. 21105/2025, seeking revival of the captioned contempt petition was preferred by the present petitioners on the ground that the time given *vide* order dated 12.12.2024, which was 12 weeks, had expired on 11.03.2025 and till that day, there was no compliance. *Vide* order dated 09.04.2025, this application of restoration was allowed and the captioned petition was restored to its original number and listed for compliance for 09.07.2025.

9. In pursuance of the said application a compliance affidavit dated 07.07.2025 was placed on record on behalf of respondent No.2, wherein, the delay was explained by way of a table giving a detailed timeline with respect to the process initiated by the respondent had been given. The same is reproduced as under:-



Date	Particulars	Annex
10.04.2018	Legal Notice by petitioner	
24.07.2018	Reply to legal notice by NSES	
2018	Writ petition bearing WP-C- 12030/2018 was filed by the petitioners	
24.07.2023	Petitioners submitted that they do not wish to press the instant petition on merit at this stage and sought a prayer to file a detailed representation/application before the concerned authority which was then allowed by this Hon'ble Court. Order dated 24.07.2023 was passed in the Writ Petition directing the Chairman, NDMC to consider the writ, counter and other application and decide the case on merits within 8 weeks after personal hearing	Annex R/2
07.08.2023	Representation made by the petitioners	
17.11.2023	BOG in its meeting held that compassionate appointment cases of NSES may be considered as per extant compassionate appointment policy/instructions issued by DoPT, GOI	Annex R/5
05.12.2023	Speaking order was passed	Annex R/3
29.12.2023	The Board of Governors, NSES in its meeting dated 29.12.2023 further discussed the issue and confirmed the decision of BOG dated 17.11.2023. The B.O.G deliberated the issue and decided to adopt DoP&T instructions as per DoP&T vide OM No. 14014/2/2012 Estt.(D) dated 16.01.2013 with amendments as made from time to time. It was decided that marking criteria will be as being followed by Central Government and adopted by NDMC for compassionate appointment in NDMC.	Annex R/6



Jan 2024	Contempt petition filed as representation not decided within 8 weeks	
29.02.2024	This Hon'ble Court observed that the petitioners are not cooperating with the respondents in completing required formalities for consideration of compassionate appointment. The Court directed the petitioners that they shall cooperate with the respondents and provide all the requisite documents to the respondents	Annex R/4
07.03.2024	Report submitted by welfare department stating that that Ms. Vidushi Singh (daughter of Late Sh. Anil Kumar Singh) and Ms. Kaushalya Rawat (wife of Late Sh. Kishan Singh Rawat) have vacated their stated addresses, and their current whereabouts are unknown.	Annex R/10 (Colly)
10.05.2024	Order of this Hon'ble Court in Contempt Case whereby respondents were directed to complete the process of compassionate appointment within 4 months	
07.09.2024	Application for extension of time moved by NSES in complying with the order dated 10.05.2024	
21.10.2024	Order of Hon'ble HC by which 4 weeks was granted to the respondents for compliance	
09.12.2024	NSES Head Office order dated 09.12.2024 vide which the contractual engagement of 21 employees (including 08 Petitioners) has been extended from 02.09.2024 to 31.03.2025 (after giving them one day break) or till their regular appointment whichever is earlier on usual terms and conditions.	



11.12.2024	However, The BOG could not be held due to various administrative reasons like transfer/posting and frequent shuffling of senior officers etc. Also, NDMC Council has taken the oath and the BOG of NSES comprises of some of the nominated Council members as per Constitution. The said nomination of BOG members of NSES was also yet to be nominated. Hence application moved for extension of time seeking compliance of order dated 21.10.2024. When this application came to be listed Le on 13.12.2024, Contempt petition was already disposed.	
12.12.2024	Contempt petition was disposed whereby this Hon'ble Court granted 12 weeks to do the needful compliance.	
20.02.2025	Constitution of the Screening Committee vide office order No. 1850/NSES/M.Secy/2025	Annex R/8
07.04.2025	Application for extension of time was moved for the reasons that: - The policy of compassionate appointment in NSES could not be placed before the B.O.G for its approval as B.O.G constitution is under process and meeting could be held after constitution. This is due to various administrative reasons like declaration of MCC in Delhi, gazette notification of council members etc. - Council of NDMC includes the sitting MPs/MLAs and as a new government has recently been formed in Delhi, hence B.O.G constitution is under progress. B.O.G of NSES comprises of some of the nominated council members as per the constitution. It is submitted that the file regarding nomination of members of BOG, NSES	



	is under process c. To comply with the directions of this Hon'ble Court dated 12.12.2024, the applicant/respondent no.2/ NSES has framed 2(Two) screening committee, on the line of NDMC guidelines on compassionate appointment, to examine each case and make its evaluation based on the criterion for considering the appointment on compassionate grounds d. The committee has already completed its work and submitted its report to the concerned authority. The Report will now be placed before the Main screening committee on 09.04.2025 to decide the cases of compassionate appointment in NSES and then the findings of the Main screening committee will be placed before the BOG, NSES for final decision subsequent to its formation. The file of BOG Nomination is already under Consideration and approval of competent authority This application was listed on 16.04.2025 however as already time extension was granted, the application became infructuous.	
	An application for restoration was also filed by petitioners seeking revival of contempt	
09.04.2025	The application of revival of contempt was listed and the Respondents were granted further 8 weeks' time to comply.	



09.04.2025	To consider the compassionate appointment in NSES, the meeting of the First meeting of the Screening Committee was held on 09.04.2025 at 11.00 A.M. However, the meeting was adjourned due to the reasons that the spot verification of one dependent namely Ms. Alka Dabral was pending as she was staying in Dehradun. It was therefore decided that spot verification was essential and the matter would be revisited after such verification.	Annex R/9
21.05.2025 05.06.2025	Reports submitted by the Welfare Department whereby the pending spot verification of Ms. Alka Dabral and Sh. Dharamraj	Annex R/10 (Colly)
16.06.2025	Second meeting of the Screening Committee took place. After considering all above-mentioned facts followed by deliberations and discussions, the Screening Committee unanimously recommended the names of 03 persons for consideration of the Competent Authority for appointment against 03 vacancies reserved for compassionate appointments.	Annex R/19

10. Along with the compliance affidavit, minutes of the Screening Committee held under the Chairpersonship of Officer on Special Duty (Education), NDMC on 09.04.2025 at 11:00 AM to consider cases for compassionate appointment in Navyug School Educational Society ((NSES)/Respondent No.2) have been placed on record. It is the case of respondent no. 2 that after due deliberations, the committee had recommended the names of three persons for consideration to the competent authority for appointment against the vacancies reserved for compassionate appointments.



In pursuance of the same, an offer of appointment dated 03.07.2025 had been issued to Smt. Kajal, Smt. Asha and Smt. Alka Dabral , which have been placed on record along with the compliance affidavit.

11. Reply to the said compliance affidavit has been filed on behalf of the petitioners, wherein it is contended that there have been violations of the directions by the respondents in terms of the order dated 24.07.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 12030/2018. It was submitted that the directions were given to the respondent to dispose of the detailed representation/application filed by the petitioners regarding the regularization of their service, keeping in mind the contents of the writ petition as well as the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondent, expeditiously within 8 weeks from the date of receiving the application/representation. It was submitted that the said time period expired on 07.10.2023, and the said directions were not complied with by the respondents. It is further contended that respondents, in complete disregard of the directions, passed a speaking order dated 05.12.2023, wherein they took a *suo moto* extension of time for a further period of 2 months from 05.12.2023, which was much after the direction passed by this Court, *i.e.*, period of 8 weeks. It is further submitted that despite further undertakings given before this Court, no decision was taken by the respondents.

12. Learned counsel for the petitioners further contended that a contrary stand, to their counter affidavit dated 28.02.2019 filed in W.P.(C) 12030/2018, has been taken by the respondent in their compliance affidavit dated 07.07.2025 filed in the present petition. It is submitted that in its counter affidavit dated 28.02.2019 *vide* paragraph 8, it was stated that the case of the petitioners was being examined in line with the instructions issued by the Government of India on compassionate appointment *vide* Office



Memorandum F.No.14014/02/2012-Estt(D) dated 16.01.2013. However, the respondent, while filing the "Affidavit of Compliance" dated 07.07.2025 took a complete U-turn and ignored the earlier Office Memorandum F.No. 14014/02/2012-Estt(D) dated 16.01.2013 and proceeded to consider regularization on compassionate appointment on the basis of a recent Office Memorandum F.No. 14014/1/2022-Estt.(D) dated 02.08.2022. On the basis of the aforesaid, it was contended that it is a settled law that the compassionate appointment policy prevalent at the time of the employee's death is applicable and not the subsequent one.

13. Learned ASG on behalf of the respondent submits that the directions for which the present contempt petition had been filed were complied with, as has been observed by the learned Predecessor Bench of this Court *vide* judgment dated 10.05.2024. It was also submitted on behalf of learned ASG that even in the order passed by learned Single Judge on 24.07.2023, the contentions of the petitioners were not pressed by themselves as has been noted in the aforesaid order. It is pointed out that if the petitioners are aggrieved by the decision taken by the Screening Committee, then they have alternate remedy with respect to the same before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

14. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

15. As noted hereinabove, the present petition has been filed for non-compliance with the order dated 24.07.2023 passed in W.P.(C) 12030/2018. For the sake of completeness, the said order reads as under:-

“1. The instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking the following reliefs:



“(i) Issue writ/order or direction in the form of mandamus or any other nature by directing all the respondents to pass appropriate regularization orders, of all the Petitioners, from the date of their first appointment, within one month from the date of the order of this Hon'ble Court,

(ii) Issue writ/order or direction in the form of mandamus or any other nature by directing all the respondents to pass appropriate order for appointing all the petitioners, in the highest stage of pay prescribed for the post occupied by them with effect from the date of their first appointment, and also appointing all the petitioners, in the highest stage of pay of Group 'C' category, according to the qualification held by them, and also grant the annual increments in that grade, for all these intervening years. Consequently, they shall be paid the differential amounts they are entitled towards the total emoluments they can draw (including dearness allowance and all other allowances), on the basis of what was actually paid to them and what they are entitled to each year, including the increase in pay scales based on recommendations of the seventh pay commission and allowances payable under the amended rules;

(iii) Issue writ/order or direction in the form of mandamus or any other nature by directing all the respondents to pass appropriate order so that, while making payments to the all Petitioners in accordance with the relief claimed by them, all the respondents shall ensure that the lump sum payments shall be appropriately spread out, in accordance with provisions of the Income tax Act, to ensure that deductions are spread out, and minimum tax effect is felt by the all the petitioners and all the respondents shall render every assistance with the income tax authorities in this regard.

(iv). Issue writ/order or direction in the form of mandamus or any other nature by directing all the respondents to pass appropriate order so that, all the benefits such as pension, terminal benefits, leave encashment, gratuity, etc shall be given to all the petitioners;

(v) Pass such other order(s)/direction(s) in the favour of the



all petitioners, as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstance of the present case and in the interest of justice, equity and fair play;

(vi) Award the cost of this petition to the all the petitioners.”

2. After some length of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that he does wish to press the instant petition on merit at this stage and seeks an innocuous prayer to file a detailed representation/application before the concerned authority. He also prayed for direction to the concerned authority for expeditious disposal of the above representation.

3. Per contra, learned counsels appearing on behalf of the respondents vehemently opposed the instant petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

5. Since learned counsel for the petitioners does not press the instant petition on merit and only made an innocuous prayer to represent his case before the concerned authority, this Court is inclined to allow the innocuous prayer made on behalf of the petitioners.

6. The petitioner is directed to file a detailed representation/application along with the copy of the instant petition including the pleadings of the petition as well as the certified copy of this order before the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council within two weeks from today and after receiving the detailed representation/application, the Chairman, New Delhi Municipal Council is directed to dispose of the detailed representation/application keeping in the mind the contents of the petition as well as of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents after giving personal hearing to the petitioners, if required and pass a detailed and reasoned order in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably within eight weeks.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the instant petition is disposed of along with pending applications, if any.”

16. Subsequently, *vide* judgment dated 10.05.2024, learned Predecessor Bench of this Court disposed of this petition by observing as under:-



“12. Thus, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the order dated 24 July, 2023, passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, is being complied with, by the respondents in its true letter and spirit.”

17. It is pertinent to note that the directions given *vide* order dated 24.07.2023 was that the respondents will decide the representation of the petitioners after giving them personal hearing. The decision on the said representation had been taken by the respondents *vide* order dated 05.02.2023, which reads as under: -

“16. After due deliberation and discussion, the BoG has approved that "Compassionate appointment cases of Navyug School Educational Society (NSES) may be considered as per the extant compassionate appointment policy/instructions issued by Department of Personnel and Training, Govt. of India."

17. Accordingly, all the matters of compassionate appointment pending in Navyug School Educational Society (NSES), the cases including those of the petitioners, will be considered and decided in a maximum time period of 2 months by following the due procedure. The petitioners will continue to work as contractual employees in NSES till then.”

18. Contention of learned counsel for the petitioners is that the appointments made by the Screening Committee are liable to be quashed by this Court owing to the fact that the same were without the approval of the Board of Governors of the Respondents, which is the competent authority for taking this decision. Secondly, these appointments are done in violation of the direction issued by this Court *vide* order dated 24.07.2023. Thirdly, the policy followed is in violation of guidelines laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the judgments cited by learned counsel for the respondent.

19. In the considered opinion of this Court, the petitioners cannot challenge the decision taken by the Screening Committee in the present contempt



petition. The submission on behalf of the petitioners with regard to various issues, including the applicability of the policy for regularization on compassionate appointments, cannot be adjudicated by this Court in the present contempt jurisdiction. In the reply filed to the compliance affidavit, the petitioners have also raised issues with regard to the discrimination in the final appointment, vis-à-vis the present petitioners. This issue also cannot be decided in the present jurisdiction. At this stage, it will be appropriate to refer to a judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **J.S. Parhihar v. Ganpat Duggar and Others, (1996) 6 SCC 291**, wherein in paragraph 6, it has been observed and held as under: -

“6. The question then is whether the Division Bench was right in setting aside the direction issued by the learned Single Judge to redraw the seniority list. It is contended by Mr S.K. Jain, the learned counsel appearing for the appellant, that unless the learned Judge goes into the correctness of the decision taken by the Government in preparation of the seniority list in the light of the law laid down by three Benches, the learned Judge cannot come to a conclusion whether or not the respondent had wilfully or deliberately disobeyed the orders of the Court as defined under Section 2(b) of the Act. Therefore, the learned Single Judge of the High Court necessarily has to go into the merits of that question. We do not find that the contention is well founded. It is seen that, admittedly, the respondents had prepared the seniority list on 2-7-1991. Subsequently promotions came to be made. The question is whether seniority list is open to review in the contempt proceedings to find out whether it is in conformity with the directions issued by the earlier Benches. It is seen that once there is an order passed by the Government on the basis of the directions issued by the court, there arises a fresh cause of action to seek redressal in an appropriate forum. The preparation of the seniority list may be wrong or may be right or may or may not be in conformity with the directions. But that would be a fresh cause of action for the aggrieved party to avail of the opportunity of judicial review. But that cannot be considered to be the wilful violation of the order. After re-exercising the judicial review in contempt proceedings, a fresh direction by the learned Single Judge cannot be given to redraw the seniority list. In



other words, the learned Judge was exercising the jurisdiction to consider the matter on merits in the contempt proceedings. It would not be permissible under Section 12 of the Act. Therefore, the Division Bench has exercised the power under Section 18 of the Rajasthan High Court Ordinance being a judgment or order of the Single Judge; the Division Bench corrected the mistake committed by the learned Single Judge. Therefore, it may not be necessary for the State to file an appeal in this Court against the judgment of the learned Single Judge when the matter was already seized of the Division Bench.”

20. Learned Predecessor Bench of this Court, as noted hereinabove, has already observed that the order dated 24.07.2023 had been complied with. The matter was kept pending for final decision in pursuance of the aforesaid speaking order dated 05.12.2023. The outcome of the same has been placed on record by way of a compliance affidavit. In case, the petitioners are aggrieved, the same can be challenged by taking recourse to other legal remedies in accordance with law. In the initial directions passed by Court *vide* order dated 24.07.2023, there was no direction of appointment of petitioners by way of compassionate appointment(s) and thus, there can be no violation of the same.

21. Needless to state that the petitioners are at liberty to challenge the decision of the Screening Committee with respect to the policy adopted in the process of compassionate appointments and subsequent appointments, in accordance with law, before the Court of competent jurisdiction.

22. With the aforesaid directions the present petition is disposed of.

23. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 20, 2025/sn/dj/ns