IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 5507 of 2017

Anjali Chhetry, Daughter of late Ram Bahadur Chhetry, resident of Arbind Nagar Road, Nepal House, P.O. Hinoo, P.S. Doranda, Dist. Ranchi, Jharkhand. .... …. Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand
2. Director General-cum-Inspector General of Police, Jharkhand, Ranchi, Police Head Quarter, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Dist: Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. Additional Director General of Police, Jharkhand Armed Police (JAP), Jharkhand, Ranchi, Police Head Quarter, P.O. & P.S. Dhurwa, Dist: Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. Inspector General of Police, Jharkhand Armed Police (JAP), Jharkhand, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, Dist: Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. Commandant, Jharkhand Armed Police (JAP), Jharkhand, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, Dist: Ranchi, Jharkhand.

.... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Diwakar Upadhyay, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sushant Kumar, AC to SC-II

Order No.06/Dated: 26.10.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for following reliefs: -

> *"a. For issuance of an appropriate writ(s)/ order(s)/ direction(s) in the nature of 'Mandamus' commanding upon the Respondents to consider the case of the Petitioner for appointment on compassionate ground on account of death of her father, as the petitioner is the legitimate daughter of the deceased employee;*
>
> *And/ Or*
>
> *b. For a further direction upon the respondent authorities to dispose of the representation preferred by the petitioner on 11.07.2017 (Annexure-4), as soon as possible, as the petitioner is in dire need of service for earning daily bread and butter for her family."*

3. It appears that the father of the petitioner had been appointed as a Constable on 02.11.1977 having Bras No. 669. He was posted under the Bihar Military Police (BMP). Thereafter, he died in harness on 15.10.1995. The plea has been taken that at the time of death, his wife got mentally disturbed and there were only two children, i.e. a son aged about 2 years 6 months and a daughter aged about 5 months. Subsequently, the

son died by drowning at the age of 5 to 6 years. The only surviving child is the daughter, who after attaining majority has applied in the year 2017 for compassionate appointment.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that compassionate appointment is nothing but compassion and there is nobody to look after the family and as such, on the basis of compassion, prayer for compassionate appointment has been made.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that compassion cannot be a substitute for law. There are certain parameters that has to be maintain. The maximum period for a person to apply for compassionate appointment is five years. In the present case, the claimant was aged about five months at the time of death of her father. Compassion has been prayed after passing of more than twenty years and as such, no relief can be granted as compassion.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, it appears that there is huge delay in making of the application i.e. more than twenty years. Thus, compassion cannot be a substitute for law.

7. In that view of the matter, I find no merit in the present writ petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

(**Rajesh Kumar, J.**)

26.10.2026
Vedanti/
Uploaded on 27.10.2026