

2. The petitioner seeks compassionate appointment. His father was serving the Bank who died-in-harness on 31st July, 2018. The petitioner applied for compassionate appointment on 24th January, 2019. The petitioner made further application seeking compassionate appointment on 28th June, 2020 as he did not get any information with regard to his previous application made by him.

3. He filed a writ petition on 18th November, 2021 which stood disposed of by the Court on 18th February, 2022, directing the Bank to consider his prayer for grant of compassionate appointment. The petitioner was a class-X pass candidate at that point of time.
4. The prayer of the petitioner stood rejected on 16th April, 2022 which he challenged by filing a writ petition, being WPA 13469 of 2022, which stood disposed of on 18th November, 2024. By the time the writ petition stood disposed of, the petitioner passed class-XII.
5. The Court delivered judgment clearly recording that the Bank rightly observed that the petitioner does not fulfil the essential educational qualification required for the posts of Part Time Sweeper, Peon and Clerk. As the Court was not convinced with the educational qualification of the petitioner, the Court did not find it necessary to enter into the aspect of monthly income of the petitioner.
6. After the judgment was delivered by the Court, the petitioner again applied for compassionate appointment which stood rejected once again by passing an order on 10th November, 2025. The same is impugned herein.
7. In the impugned rejection, apart from the issue of ineligibility of the petitioner on the ground of educational qualification, the financial criterion has also been considered.

8. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that he satisfies the financial eligibility threshold and, accordingly, his case ought to be considered for grant of compassionate appointment.
9. Learned advocate for the petitioner also submits that in the earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner, the Court did not have any occasion to look into his financial eligibility for the job and, as such, the present writ petition has been filed for ascertaining his financial eligibility for being considered for compassionate appointment.
10. The petitioner prays for setting aside the impugned order of rejection with a direction upon the Bank to issue appointment letter in his favour.
11. The Bank has filed a report in the form of an affidavit clearly disclosing that the petitioner neither qualifies on the ground of educational qualification nor the financial criterion.
12. It has been submitted the issue has been finally set at rest by the Hon'ble Court in the earlier writ petition filed by the petitioner. No challenge has been made to the order passed by the learned Single Judge.
13. Upon hearing the submissions made on behalf of both the parties, it appears that two criteria are required for consideration of a case for compassionate appointment. First is the educational criterion and the next is the immediate financial threshold. Both the criteria are required to be satisfied for obtaining the job.

14. The Court in the judgment dated 18th November, 2024 clearly recorded that the petitioner does not fulfil the essential educational qualification. Non-fulfilling any one of the criteria disqualifies the candidate for being considered for compassionate appointment.

15. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the said finding of the Hon'ble Court is erroneous. It has been submitted that because of such incorrect finding, the petitioner applied before the Bank for reconsideration of his case. The petitioner, not being aware of the legal provision, did not challenge the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge before the Hon'ble Division Bench.

16. According to the petitioner, he has challenged the impugned order dated 10th November, 2025 in the instant writ petition. The same is a fresh cause of action and the Court ought to enter into the merit of the same.

17. The Court is not at all convinced with the submission made on behalf of the petitioner. Once the Court has come to a considered finding that the petitioner does not fulfil the essential educational qualification and the said finding of the Court has not been tested in appeal, then it has to be taken that the judgment passed by the learned Single Judge attained finality.

18. If the petitioner contends that the said finding is an erroneous one, then the petitioner ought to have preferred an appeal against the said judgment before the appropriate forum. The petitioner, instead of preferring an appeal before the judicial forum, applied before the Bank for reconsideration of his case.

19. It appears that the petitioner went on making repeated applications before the Bank seeking compassionate appointment and the Bank repeatedly rejected his prayer. Each rejection does not amount to a fresh cause of action as the ground for rejection remains the same.

20. One of such rejection orders was decided against the petitioner by the learned Single Judge in WPA 13469 of 2022. The same issue could not have been re-agitated by the petitioner in the present writ petition claiming that there is a fresh cause of action.

21. The Court is convinced that the issue in question already stood decided by the Hon'ble Court in the previous round of litigation filed by the petitioner and there is hardly any scope to re-appreciate the issue all over again.

22. In view of the above, the Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction in the matter. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

23. All parties shall act on the basis of a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

24. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)