



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**W.P.No.6959 of 2025
and W.M.P.Nos.7684 of 2025 and 975 of 2026**

P.Lakshmi

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chairman,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Kuralagam,
Chennai-600 104.

2.The District Collector,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Chief Executive Officer,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Kuralagam,
Chennai-600 104.

4.The Assistant Director,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Villupuram District.

....Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the respondents in connection with the impugned orders issued by the third respondent in Na.Ka.No.3444/E.2(1)/2015 dated 24.03.2023 and



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

Na.Ka.No.3444/E.2(1)/2015 dated 25.09.2024 and quash the same and further, direct the respondents 2 and 3 to issue suitable appointment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds and grant other such relief.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rajendran
for M/s.Dineshkumar Associates

For Respondents : Mr.C.Rajakumar
for R1, R3 and R4
Mr.P.Balathandayutham
Special Government Pleader
for R2

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned orders issued by the third respondent in Na.Ka.No.3444/E.2(1)/2015 dated 24.03.2023 and in Na.Ka.No.3444/E.2(1)/2015 dated 25.09.2024 and for a consequential direction to the respondents 2 and 3 to issue suitable appointment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds and grant other such relief.

2. The petitioner sought for compassionate appointment as her father who was working as Night Watchman in Khadi and Village Industries Board died in harness on 24.10.2002. The petitioner and two other daughters were



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

the legal heirs of the deceased employee. The petitioner's mother applied for compassionate appointment for one of her daughters, namely, Maheswari, elder sister of the petitioner on 28.09.2007, however, the said request was not considered. Unfortunately, the said Maheswari died on 21.12.2010. However, the application submitted by the petitioner's sister was not considered. Subsequently, the petitioner made an application for appointment on compassionate grounds on 24.06.2015. The same was recommended, however, the third respondent rejected the claim of the petitioner stating that already the petitioner's elder sister was considered for appointment and thereafter, the petitioner was substituted in the place of elder sister. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner who challenges the impugned order on the ground that the application for compassionate appointment was made by the mother of the petitioner on time, immediately after the death of the father. However, the same was not considered and was kept pending for a long time. Since the petitioner's elder sister demised in the meantime, the petitioner sought for substitution of her



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

name in the name of the elder sister and requested for compassionate appointment in the year 2015. Even though clarifications were sought for by the third respondent, vide proceedings dated 17.06.2015, the petitioner immediately submitted the required documents on 24.06.2015 and nothing moved thereafter. To a shock and surprise, the petitioner was intimated by the proceedings dated 11.06.2018 that the files were closed and the records were destroyed due to lapse of long period of time. The petitioner, therefore, prayed by way of this writ petition questioning the lethargic attitude of the respondents in considering the appointment. Though the petitioner is eligible to be appointed on compassionate grounds, her request was not considered in time.

4. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4 submits that initially, the petitioner's mother has made an application for her elder sister, namely, Maheswari in the year 2007, however, she died in the year 2010 and thereafter, after a lapse of 8 years, the petitioner made application which is beyond the period of limitation and therefore, the third respondent rejected the request of the petitioner. Hence, he prays for dismissal of this writ petition.



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Nos.1, 3 and 4 and the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the second respondent.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner's father died in the year 2002. Immediately thereafter, the petitioner's mother applied for compassionate appointment for her elder daughter, namely, Maheswari. Unfortunately, the said Maheswari died in the year 2010. It is to be noted that till the death of the elder daughter (i.e.,) Maheswari, the request for compassionate appointment was not at all considered by the respondents and was kept pending for more than eight years. Thereby, the petitioner's mother applied for compassionate appointment to the second daughter, namely, Lakshmi in the year 2015 and the application though was recommended by the first and second respondents, was rejected by the third respondent by the impugned proceedings citing that the substitution of the petitioner in the place of Maheswari, elder daughter of the petitioner's father has been made belatedly. The respondents had kept the application pending for more than a decade without passing any orders, though the employee died in harness in the year



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

2002. The application was not considered till 2010 and therefore, the petitioner has made an application for substitution of her name. This shows the lethargic attitude on the part of the respondents in keeping the compassionate appointment application pending for a long time. Admittedly, the petitioner is a deserving candidate, who requires to be appointed on compassionate grounds. Therefore, the delay on the part of the respondents in keeping the application pending for more than eight years and thereafter, rejecting the same on lame reasons cannot be justified. Hence, the impugned orders dated 24.03.2023 and 25.09.2024 passed by the third respondent are set aside. The third respondent is directed to consider the petitioner's application for compassionate appointment and provide suitable post to the petitioner on compassionate grounds.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is allowed. There shall be no order as to costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

05.02.2026

NCC: Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Speaking Order : Yes / No
ssb



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Chairman,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Kuralagam,
Chennai-600 104.
- 2.The District Collector,
Tiruvannamalai.
- 3.The Chief Executive Officer,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Kuralagam,
Chennai-600 104.
- 4.The Assistant Director,
Khadi and Village Industries Board,
Villupuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.6959 of 2025

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

ssb

W.P.No.6959 of 2025

05.02.2026