

21st April., 2026
Item no.D/L 06
Court No. 18
Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA 21759 of 2025**

In the matter of:
Dipanjana Kirtania *Petitioners*
VS.
The Union of India & Ors. *Respondents*

For the Petitioners:
Mr. Benazir Shaikh *Advocate*
For the Union of India:
Ms. Smita Pal
Mr. Ravi Ranjan Kumar *Advocates*

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner claims to be the grandson of one Haribar Kirtania who was serving in the Farakka Barrage Project. He was terminated on medical ground on 18th August, 1988 with effect from 8th July, 1988.
3. The petitioner, claiming to be the grandson of the said employee, has approached the authority seeking appointment on compassionate ground.
4. He relies on the communication made by the employer in favour of his uncle Sri Harasit Kirtania who is currently aged about sixty two years and not eligible for appointment as he is age barred.
5. The uncle of the petitioner Sri Harasit Kirtania made a representation before the General Manager, Farraka Barrage Project for

sympathetic consideration for appointment of his nephew, the petitioner herein.

6. A representation was filed by the petitioner before the General Manager, Farakka Barrage Project on 3rd March, 2025. Prayer has been made to direct the authority to consider his representation.
7. Learned advocate representing the respondent opposes the prayer of the petitioner.
8. It has been submitted that the petitioner cannot be considered to be a dependant of the deceased employee. The employee in question stood terminated from service way back in the year 1988.
9. Having heard the submissions made on behalf of both the parties and on perusal of the materials on record, it is evident that the grandfather of the petitioner stood terminated from service way back in July, 1988. Since thereafter there has been no communication made by and between the parties.
10. In the year 2025 an application has been made by the petitioner followed by a representation seeking appointment on compassionate ground relying on a communication made by the authority to his uncle.
11. It is settled law that employment on compassionate ground cannot be claimed as a matter of right. The same is provided to the heir of the deceased family members only to tide over the immediate financial crisis faced on the death of the sole bread winner.
12. In the instant case, the employee stood terminated from service in July, 1988. In the year 2025, the prayer of the grandson of the deceased employee, cannot be considered for providing compassionate appointment.

13. Learned advocate for the petitioner has not been able to show any scheme which permits grant of such employment after three decades of termination of an employee to the grandson of the terminated employee.
14. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
15. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.
16. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)