IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

L.P.A. No. 533 of 2025

Ajay Kumar Pundriar, aged about 49 years, S/o Late GanpatiMahto, R/o Goswami Tola, P.O.& P.S. Kanke, District- Ranchi, Jharkhand ... Writ Petitioner/ Appellant

Versus

1. Union of India, Department of Posts, represented through Chief Postmaster General, Jharkhand Circle, Meghdoot Bhawan, Ranchi, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kanke, District Ranchi
2. Asst. Director (P), Postal Department, Jharkhand Circle, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District- Ranchi
3. Sr. Supdt. Of Post Office, Ranchi, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District- Ranchi

... Respondents/ Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ PRASAD

For the Appellant: Mr. Shankalp Goswami, Advocate
For the Resp.- UOI: A.C. to A.S.G.I.

02/Dated: 23.09.2026

1. Heard Mr. Shankalp Goswami, counsel for the appellant.

2. I.A. No. 11759 of 2025, the appellant seeks condonation of delay of 152 days in filing the accompanying appeal.

3. Apart from the fact that no cogent reasons have been given in support of the delay, even if wewere to adopt a liberal approach and condone the delay,we are satisfied that the accompanying appeal against the learned Single Judge's order dated 16.10.2024, dismissing the appellant's W.P.(S) No. 650 of 2024, warrants dismissal.

4. The appellant in this case is seeking compassionate appointment on the ground that his father died in harness in the year 2001.

5. The appellant applied for a compassionate appointment in 2003, and the application was rejected on 28.07.2003, inter alia, on the ground that the appellant's family owned substantial land, and no case was made out for the grant of any compassionate appointment.

6. For a period of almost ten years, the appellant did not react to or challenge the rejection order dated 28.07.2003. After ten years, the appellant instituted an Original Application (O.A.) Case No. 09 of 2013 (R) before the Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT). The same was dismissed as barred by limitation.

7. The appellant did not challenge the CAT's order dated 04.03.2014 but instead applied again for reconsideration of his plea for compassionate appointment on 02.05.2016. The learned Counsel for the petitioner initially contended that the CAT had granted liberty to represent. Later, the learned Counsel admitted that no such liberty was granted. The respondents also turned down this application on 23.06.2017, stating that there were no grounds for reconsideration.

8. Again, for almost seven years, the petitioner did not react to or challenge the order dated 23.06.2017. After seven years, the

petitioner instituted W.P. (S) No. 650 of 2024, which the Single Judge dismissed by the impugned order.

9. On perusing the reasoning in the impugned order and considering the above-referred facts, we are satisfied that no case is made out for interference. The appellant has acted indolently throughout, and given such gross indolence, it is apparent that the appellant does not merit a compassionate appointment. Prima facie, the principle of res judicata, or at least a principle analogous thereto, is also applicable to this case. In any event, on the ground of delay and laches, the petitioner's claim for compassionate appointment warranted no consideration.

10. For all the above reasons, we dismiss the interlocutory application and the accompanying appeal without any order as to costs.

(M.S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Manoj Prasad, J.)

September 23, 2026

Pramanik/Anjali
Uploaded on 28.09.2026