CGHC010420182026 2026:CGHC:45930

NAFR

JYOTI SHARMA
Digitally signed by JYOTI SHARMA
Date: 2026.11.02 17:19:32 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 7813 of 2026

Devendra Bhonsle S/o. Late Vijay Kumar Bhonsle Aged About 30 Years R/o. Kududand, Near Milan Chowk, District - Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Nava Raipur, Atal Nagar, District Raipur (C.G.)

2. The Chief Engieer Minimata (Hasdeo) Bango Project, Water Resources Department, Bilaspur (C.G.)

3. The Superintending Engineer Hasdeo Project Division, Water Resources Department, Rampur / Korba, District Korba (C.G.)

4. Smt. Punam Bhonsle, W/o. Late Shri Vijay Bhonsle, R/o. Abhishek Nagar, Phase-I, Mangla, Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Gajendra Prakash Sahu, Advocate
For Respondent/ State	:	Mr. S.S. Baghel, G.A.

Hon’ble Shri Bibhu Datta Guru, Judge

Order on Board

30/10/2026

1. By way of the present writ petition, the petitioner has called in question Annexure P-1 dated 16.09.2026, whereby his application dated 07.01.2026 (Annexure P-7), seeking compassionate appointment on account of the death of his father, Late Shri Vijay Kumar Bhonsle, who died in harness on 13.12.2025 while working as a Driver in the Water Resources Department, was returned on the ground that the application was not accompanied by the

consent of the other family members. The petitioner further submits that respondent No. 4, who is the second wife of the deceased employee, has also submitted an application seeking compassionate appointment. In the aforesaid circumstances, the petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction to the respondents to consider his claim by passing a reasoned and speaking order after affording an opportunity of hearing to both the competing claimants.

2. Learned State counsel submits that although the petitioner's application dated 07.01.2026 seeking compassionate appointment was returned to him, no reasoned order has been passed on the same. It is further submitted that since respondent No. 4, being the second wife of the deceased employee, has also submitted an application seeking compassionate appointment, the claims of both the petitioner and respondent No. 4 shall be considered jointly, in accordance with the applicable policy.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

4. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner, particularly the fact that the petitioner's application seeking compassionate appointment on account of the death of his father, Late Shri Vijay Kumar Bhonsle, was returned on the ground that the consent of the other family members had not been furnished, and further taking into consideration the fact that respondent No. 4, who is also a family member of the deceased employee, has independently staked her claim for compassionate

appointment, this Court is of the considered view that the competing claims deserve consideration by the competent authority in accordance with the applicable policy. Accordingly, it is directed that, in the event the petitioner submits a fresh application seeking compassionate appointment within 15 days, the competent authority shall consider the claim of the petitioner jointly with the claim of respondent No. 4, in accordance with the applicable policy, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all the concerned parties, and shall pass a reasoned and speaking order in respect of their respective claims within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the fresh application.

5. With the aforesaid directions and observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE

Jyoti