



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

223

CWP-2586-2021

Date of Decision : 16.03.2026

Paramjit Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : Mr. Pradeep Virk, Senior Advocate assisted by
Mr. Amandeep Singh Punia, Mr. Ajay Sharma and
Ms. Komal Jindal, Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnampreet Singh Chauhan, D.A.G., Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing/setting aside the impugned order dated 07.07.2017 (Annexure P-15), passed by respondent No.2, whereby the claim of the petitioner for appointment on the post of Clerk on compassionate ground has been rejected. Further, seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus for directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Clerk on compassionate ground, in view of the instructions dated 05.02.1996 (Annexure P-12) and 21.11.2002 (Annexure P-13), issued by the Punjab Government and also to grant him all consequential benefits for which he is legally entitled.

2. Brief facts of the case, as have been pleaded in the instant petition, are that the father of the petitioner namely, Dalbara Singh, who was appointed as a Social Studies Master in the Punjab Education

**CWP-2586-2021****2**

Department during the year 1973-74, unfortunately died on 02.01.1984 leaving behind his pregnant wife and one daughter. The petitioner was born on 17.08.1984 i.e. after the death of his father. After passing of 10+2 examination, the petitioner had applied for appointment in the State service on compassionate grounds, vide application dated 05.07.2006 (Annexure P-1) on the prescribed proforma. The case of the petitioner was duly forwarded by the Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Kadiana Kalan, District Ludhiana, where the father of the petitioner was posted at the time of his death, to respondent No.3- District Education Officer (Secondary Education), Ludhiana, vide letter dated 06.07.2006 (Annexure P-2). However, the case of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds was rejected by respondent No.3 on the ground that the petitioner had completed 18 years of age on 17.08.2002, whereas he has submitted application for compassionate appointment on 05.07.2006, after a delay of 04 years. Thereafter, the petitioner had again submitted an application for appointment on compassionate grounds stating therein that he belongs to illiterate and poor family and no one guided the petitioner to submit the application immediately on attaining the age of 18 years and further requested in application that a sympathetic view should be taken. Thereafter, the case of the petitioner was forwarded by respondent No.3 to the Director of Public Instructions (Secondary Education), Punjab, vide letter dated 29.11.2007 (Annexure P-3), however, no action was taken on the same by the respondents. Thereafter, the petitioner had filed various representations to various authorities claiming appointment on

**CWP-2586-2021****3**

compassionate grounds, but to no avail. Consequently, the petitioner served a justice demand notice dated 05.09.2016 (Annexure P-10) upon the respondents, through his counsel, to finalize his claim for appointment on compassionate grounds. When no action was taken by the respondents on the said legal notice, the petitioner approached this Court by filing CWP No.1954 of 2017 (Paramjit Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others), seeking issuance of directions to the respondents to appoint the petitioner as a Clerk on compassionate grounds. The said writ petition was disposed of by this Court, vide order dated 03.02.2017 (Annexure P-14), with a direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice of the petitioner by passing a speaking order in accordance with law within a period of four months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order. Pursuant to the order dated 03.02.2017, passed by this Court, respondent No.2 has passed the impugned order dated 07.07.2017, rejecting the claim of the petitioner on the ground of delay. Hence the instant petition.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner completed his 10+2 examination in the year 2001 and thereafter, secured admission in Panjab University for pursuing graduation. Due to this reason, he could not apply for appointment on compassionate grounds in the year 2002 as he was pursuing his graduation at that time. He further submits that when the petitioner could not complete his graduation, he immediately moved an application seeking appointment on compassionate grounds in the year 2006. Therefore, the claim of the petitioner has been wrongly rejected

**CWP-2586-2021****4**

by respondent No.2, vide impugned order dated 07.07.2017, on the ground of delay. He further submits that the case of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds is squarely covered by the instructions dated 05.02.1996 (Annexure P-12) and 21.11.2002 (Annexure P-13), issued by Punjab Government as there is no other earning member in the petitioner's family.

4. Per contra, learned State counsel submits that the impugned order dated 07.07.2017, passed by respondent No.2, rejecting the claim of the petitioner on the ground of delay is completely valid and lawful as the petitioner attained the age of majority in the year 2002, whereas he applied for appointment on compassionate grounds in the year 2006 after a delay of four years. Therefore, the instant petition deserves dismissal.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Admittedly, the father of the petitioner unfortunately died in harness, on 02.01.1984, leaving behind his pregnant wife and one daughter. The petitioner was born on 17.08.1984, after the death of his father. It is the case of the petitioner that he completed his 10+2 in the year 2001 and then he took admission in Panjab University to pursue his graduation and since he was busy with his studies, therefore, he could not apply for a job on compassionate grounds in 2002, the year he attained majority. However, when the petitioner could not complete his graduation, he immediately moved an application for appointment on compassionate grounds in the year 2006.



CWP-2586-2021

5

7. The very object of the scheme of compassionate appointment presupposes that the request must be made within the time stipulated, or at the very least, within the reasonable period. In the present case, a period of more than 23 years has passed from the date the petitioner attained majority i.e. 17.08.2002 and even the legal notice dated 05.09.2016, served by the petitioner was decided on 07.07.2017, whereby the claim of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds has been rejected by the respondents and the petitioner approached this Court for quashing of the said order in the month of February, 2021 i.e. after a lapse of period of more than 03 years. As per settled law, appointment on compassionate basis cannot be claimed as a matter of right. Such belated claims defeat the purpose of compassionate appointment and cannot be entertained. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has consistently held that the stale and delayed applications for compassionate appointment are liable to be rejected and cannot be directed to be considered as a matter of right. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***The Chief Commissioner, Central Excise and Customs, Lucknow and others Vs. Prabhat Singh : 2013(2) S.C.T. 58*** while considering the similar issue has held as under:-

“13. Most importantly, the High Court did not take into consideration one of the most significant reasons depicted in the orders passed by the appellants (dated 5.1.2006 and 22.5.2008), namely, that under the OM dated 5.5.2003 appointment on compassionate ground was permissible within a period of three years from the date of death of the concerned employee in harness. Vijay Bahadur Singh, the father of Prabhat Singh had died on 2.3.1996. The candidature of Prabhat Singh, for appointment on compassionate ground, under the OM dated 5.5.2003 could have been considered only till 1.3.1999. Thereafter,



Prabhat Singh was rendered ineligible for appointment on compassionate ground. Pointedly, on aforesaid ground the Review Committee constituted by the appellants to consider the claims of dependents of employees who had died in harness, vide an order dated 21.9.2007, had excluded the names of persons including Prabhat Singh, from the list of pending cases for appointment on compassionate ground, because they could no longer be appointed on compassionate ground, since more than three years had expired after the death of the concerned bread winner in harness. Had the High Court or the Tribunals applied their mind to the aforesaid pre-condition for eligibility for appointment on compassionate ground, none of the directions issued by the High Court or the Tribunals would have been issued. Such directions could have been issued only when the party approaching the Tribunal or the High Court had established a prima facie case, by demonstrating fulfillment of the terms and conditions stipulated in rules/regulations/policy instructions/office memoranda, relevant for such consideration. Had the aforesaid simple exercise been carried out, it would not have been necessary to examine the matter again and again. In the instant case, on a simple issue of compassionate appointment, there have been repeated rounds of litigation, the first time before the CAT-Allahabad Bench, then before the CAT-Lucknow Bench, and thereafter, before the High Court. From the High Court the matter has now been carried to this Court. If only the pre-requisite eligibility of Prabhat Singh for appointment on compassionate ground had been examined, it would not have been necessary to examine the matter again, and yet again. The instant observations have been recorded only to demonstrate how judicial time at different levels has been wasted by entertaining a frivolous litigation. Surely, because Prabhat Singh had approached a judicial forum nine years after the death of his father, whereas, appointment on compassionate ground is permissible only within three years of the death of the bread winner, the matter deserved to have been rejected at the stage of first entertainment.

14. We are constrained to record that even compassionate appointments are regulated by norms. Where such norms have been laid down, the same have to be strictly followed. Where claims for appointment on



compassionate ground, exceed, the available vacancies (which can be filled up by way of compassionate appointment), a selection process has to be adopted by the competent authority. The said process, necessarily has to be fair, and based on a comparative compassion gradient of eligible candidates, or on some such like criterion having a nexus to the object sought to be achieved. In other words, where there are two candidates but only one vacancy is available, there should be a clear, transparent and objective criterion to determine which of the two should be chosen. In the absence of a prescribed criteria, a fair selection process has to be followed, so that, the exercise carried out in choosing one of the two candidates against a solitary available vacancy, can be shown to be based on reason, fair-play and non arbitrariness.

15. The very object of making provision for appointment on compassionate ground, is to provide succor to a family dependent on a Government employee, who has unfortunately died in harness. On such death, the family suddenly finds itself in dire straits, on account of the absence of its sole bread winner. Delay in seeking such a claim, is an ante thesis, for the purpose for which compassionate appointment was conceived. Delay in raising such a claim, is contradictory to the object sought to be achieved. The instant controversy reveals that even though Vijay Bahadur Singh, the father of the applicant (Prabhat Singh) seeking appointment on compassionate ground had died on 2.3.1996, Prabhat Singh sought judicial redress, for the first time, by approaching the CAT-Allahabad Bench in 2005. By such time, there was no surviving right for appointment on compassionate ground under the OM dated 5.5.2003. As already noticed above, appointment on compassionate ground under the OM dated 5.5.2003 is permissible within three years of the death of the bread winner in harness. By now, sixteen years have passed by, and as such, there can be no surviving claim for compassionate appointment.

16. Courts and Tribunals should not fall prey to any sympathy syndrome, so as to issue directions for compassionate appointments, without reference to the prescribed norms. Courts are not supposed to carry Santa Claus's big bag on Christmas eve, to disburse the gift of compassionate appointment, to all those who seek a court's



intervention. Courts and Tribunals must understand, that every such act of sympathy, compassion and discretion, wherein directions are issued for appointment on compassionate ground, could deprive a really needy family requiring financial support, and thereby, push into penury a truly indigent, destitute and impoverish family. Discretion is therefore ruled out. So are, misplaced sympathy and compassion."

8. Further the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jagdish Prasad Vs.**

State of Bihar : 1996 (1) SCC 301 has held as under: -

"3.The very object of appointment of a dependent of the deceased employee who died in harness is to relieve unexpected immediate hardship and distress caused to the family by sudden demise of the earning member of the family. Since the death occurred way back in 1971, in which year the appellant was four years old, it cannot be said that he is entitled to be appointed after he attained majority long thereafter. In other words, if that contention is accepted, it amounts to another mode of recruitment of the dependent of a deceased Government servant which cannot be encouraged, de hors the recruitment rules."

9. A Division Bench of this Court in **Bijender Singh Vs.**

State of Haryana : 1999(3) SCT 98 has held as under: -

"20. One of the principles which is clearly discernible from the various judicial precedents referred to above, is that the minor dependent of deceased employee cannot claim appointment as of right on his/her attaining majority and unless the rules or the administrative instructions which regulate ex gratia employment/compassionate appointment provide for consideration of the claim of such dependent after he/she becomes major, the Court cannot issue a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the public employer to appoint such dependent after lapse of many years. It is also consistent view of the Courts that long time gap between the date of the death of the employee and the date of submission of application by an eligible dependent is sufficient to draw an inference that the family of the deceased was not in dire need of assistance in the form of ex-gratia employment/compassionate appointment."



10. This Court while considering similar issue in ***Tinku Vs.***

State of Haryana and others : 2021(4) SCT 18 has held as under: -

“8. It is well settled that appointment to public office is required to be made by strictly adhering to the mandatory requirement of the Constitution. Compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule. Provision has been made in order to help the bereaving family immediately, who has lost its bread earner, to tide over the immediate crisis. Compassionate appointment is not a right but a concession. A government/public employment is not a hereditary office. Such provision has been made to provide immediate succor to the dependents of the deceased. Moreover, it is also well settled that the compassionate appointment cannot be claimed as a matter of right especially after a passage of time. Reference in this regard can be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana (1994) 4 SCC 138***.

11. On the basis of case laws decided earlier, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***The State of West Bengal Vs. Debabrata Tiwari and others : 2025(5) SCC 712*** has laid down certain guidelines for compassionate appointment and observed as under: -

“7.2. On consideration of the aforesaid decisions of this Court, the following principles emerge:

i. That a provision for compassionate appointment makes a departure from the general provisions providing for appointment to a post by following a particular procedure of recruitment. **Since such a provision enables appointment being made without following the said procedure, it is in the nature of an exception to the general provisions and must be resorted to only in order to achieve the stated objectives, i.e., to enable the family of the deceased to get over the sudden financial crisis.**

ii. Appointment on compassionate grounds is not a source of recruitment. The reason for making such a benevolent scheme by the State or the public sector undertaking is to see that the dependants of the deceased are not deprived of the means of



livelihood. It only enables the family of the deceased to get over the sudden financial crisis.

iii. Compassionate appointment is not a vested right which can be exercised at any time in future. Compassionate employment cannot be claimed or offered after a lapse of time and after the crisis is over.

iv. That compassionate appointment should be provided immediately to redeem the family in distress. It is improper to keep such a case pending for years.

v. In determining as to whether the family is in financial crisis, all relevant aspects must be borne in mind including the income of the family, its liabilities, the terminal benefits if any, received by the family, the age, dependency and marital status of its members, together with the income from any other source.

7.3. The object underlying a provision for grant of compassionate employment is to enable the family of the deceased employee to tide over the sudden crisis due to the death of the bread-earner which has left the family in penury and without any means of livelihood. Out of pure humanitarian consideration and having regard to the fact that unless some source of livelihood is provided, the family would not be in a position to make both ends meet, a provision is made for giving gainful appointment to one of the dependants of the deceased who may be eligible for such appointment. Having regard to such an object, it would be of no avail to grant compassionate appointment to the dependants of the deceased employee, after the crisis which arose on account of death of a bread-winner, has been overcome. Thus, there is also a compelling need to act with a sense of immediacy in matters concerning compassionate appointment because on failure to do so, the object of the scheme of compassionate would be frustrated. Where a long lapse of time has occurred since the date of death of the deceased employee, the sense of immediacy for seeking compassionate appointment would cease to exist and thus lose its significance and this would be a relevant circumstance which must weigh with the authorities in determining as to whether a case for the



grant of compassionate appointment has been made out for consideration.

7.4. As noted above, the sine qua non for entertaining a claim for compassionate appointment is that the family of the deceased employee would be unable to make two ends meet without one of the dependants of the deceased employee being employed on compassionate grounds. The financial condition of the family of the deceased, at the time of the death of the deceased, is the primary consideration that ought to guide the authorities' decision in the matter.

*7.5. Considering the second question referred to above, in the first instance, regarding whether applications for compassionate appointment could be considered after a delay of several years, we are of the view that, in a case where, for reasons of prolonged delay, either on the part of the applicant in claiming compassionate appointment or the authorities in deciding such claim, the sense of immediacy is diluted and lost. Further, the financial circumstances of the family of the deceased, may have changed, for the better, since the time of the death of the government employee. In such circumstances, Courts or other relevant authorities are to be guided by the fact that for such prolonged period of delay, the family of the deceased was able to sustain themselves, most probably by availing gainful employment from some other source. Granting compassionate appointment in such a case, as noted by this Court in *Hakim Singh* would amount to treating a claim for compassionate appointment as though it were a matter of inheritance based on a line of succession which is contrary to the Constitution. Since compassionate appointment is not a vested right and the same is relative to the financial condition and hardship faced by the dependents of the deceased government employee as a consequence of his death, a claim for compassionate appointment may not be entertained after lapse of a considerable period of time since the death of the government employee.”*

12. A Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Gurbhinder Singh***

Vs. State of Punjab and others : 2025 NCPHHC 177771 has held as

under :-



“5. The legal principles governing compassionate appointments are well-settled and have been consistently reiterated by the Supreme Court. It is trite that compassionate appointment is not a right, but a concession granted to the family of a deceased employee to tide over sudden financial crisis arising out of the death of the sole breadwinner. The object is to provide immediate relief, not to provide employment as a matter of course or opening a backdoor entry into employment.

6. A Two Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Uttaranchal Jal Sansthan v. Laxmi Devi (2009) 11 SCC 453*** held that, “***Since rules relating to compassionate appointment permit a sidedoor entry, the same have to be given strict interpretation***”. Further reliance may be placed on another Two Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***SAIL v. Madhusudan Das (2008) 15 SCC 560*** observed that, “Compassionate appointment is a concession and not a right and the criteria laid down in the Rules must be satisfied by all aspirants.” It has been crystallized by the Hon’ble Apex Court that compassionate appointments must be made strictly in adherence to the policy, to the extent that in ***Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. Dharmendra Sharma (2007) 8 SCC 148*** the Hon’ble Apex Court stated that the courts cannot compel the employer to make appointments on compassionate ground contrary to its policy.

7. Moreover recently, a Two-Judge Bench of the Hon’ble Apex Court in ***Canara Bank v. Ajithkumar G.K. 2025 INSC 184***, the Supreme Court reiterated the necessity of strict adherence to the policy and emphasized that the financial condition of the family, availability of other means of sustenance, and existence of genuine indigence are critical factors. The Court held that where the family is not in immediate financial distress, the very basis for compassionate appointment ceases to exist.

8. Further, the Hon’ble Apex Court in ***State Bank of India v. Somvir Singh 2007 (4) SCC 778***, held that the **terminal benefits, investments, monthly family income including the family pension and income of family from other sources, viz. agricultural land were rightly taken into consideration by the authority to decide whether the family is living in penury.** The Hon’ble Apex Court through a catena of judgments has observed that:



Financial condition of the family of the deceased employee, allegedly in distress or penury, has to be evaluated or else the object of the scheme would stand defeated inasmuch as in such an eventuality, any and every dependent of an employee dying in harness would claim employment as if public employment is heritable, reliance in this regard may be placed on ***Union of India v. Shashank Goswami (2012) 11 SCC 307, Union Bank of India v. M. T. Latheesh (2006) 7 SCC 350, National Hydroelectric Power Corporation v. Nank Chand (2004) 12 SCC 487 and Punjab National Bank v. Ashwini Kumar Taneja (2004) 7 SCC 265.***

9. In the present case, a perusal of the impugned minutes of meeting dated NIL (Annexure P-9) reveals that the respondent/Corporation examined the pending cases of compassionate appointment in detail and recorded the following findings:-

"After examining in detail the 7 pending cases available on page 1 to 3, it has been found that in these 7 cases, the wife/husband of the deceased employee is in government/non-government service and is earning at the time of death of the deceased employee and these cases have not been found eligible as per the above instructions issued by the Punjab Government for providing jobs to the heirs of the deceased employee on compassionate grounds. Apart from this, regarding case mentioned at Sr. No. 3, applicant has submitted a copy of the Will executed by his father. According to which his father has recorded in the Will that if anything happens to him during his service, then his daughter Jatwinder Kaur will be entitled to receive all his funds and he will also apply for the deduction of nomination of his wife from his funds and if any other benefits are received from the department apart from the salary, then his son Gurbinder Singh will be entitled to receive it. After examining the Will, the committee found that this Will was registered on 23.07.2020 after the death of the deceased employee Mr. Paramjit Singh, which is baseless because at the time this Will was registered, the testator had died. Apart from this, as per the records of the department, the pensionary benefits of



the employee such as GP fund etc. have been paid to the wife of the deceased employee. In view of which, since this case is covered in the category of spouse working cases, this case should be disposed of as this case is not eligible for providing job on compassionate grounds. Therefore, the committee recommends the cancellation of these 7 cases."

10. *From the perusal of the record, it is evident that the mother of the petitioner, namely Sarabjeet Kaur, was employed in the Punjab School Education Board at the time of the death of Sh. Paramjit Singh i.e. 26.10.2019. Although she retired subsequently on 31.05.2021, the fact remains that she was a breadwinner for the family at the crucial time of the employee's death. Furthermore, she is now a recipient of pensionary benefits in addition to the terminal benefits already disbursed to her.*

11. *These factors are directly related to determining whether the family is in such penury that compassionate appointment is warranted. The authority is entitled to satisfy itself that the claimant is genuinely dependent and the family has no other sufficient means of support. The fact that the spouse was working and earning at the time of death and continues to have financial stability through pension, fundamentally negates the claim of "financial destitution."*

12. *It is pertinent to note that compassionate appointment is intended to meet an immediate financial crisis, whereas in the present case the claim has been pursued after a considerable lapse of time from the date of death of the employee. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Canara Bank's case (supra)** and other decisions has cautioned against granting compassionate appointment after a long lapse of time as the immediacy of the crisis is lost.*

13. *The aim of compassionate appointment is not to open a backdoor entry into employment or to treat public employment as heritable right but to help the dependents in times of immediate need as the breadwinner passes away. Given the gainful employment of the petitioner's mother at the time of death and the subsequent receipt of retirement and pensionary benefits, the family cannot be deemed to be in a state of financial crisis that warrants this exceptional concession."*



13. Further, the Rajasthan High Court in ***Smt. Parwati Devi and another v. Director, (G) & Nodal Officer (PG), Ministry of Mines, Geology Survey of India and others : 2022 SCC Online Raj 410***, relying upon the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed as under: -

"14. It has also been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. & Ors. v. Nirval Singh, reported in (2019) 6 SCC 774" that delay in pursuing claim/approaching court would mitigate against claim for compassionate appointment as very objective of providing immediate amelioration to family would stand extinguished.

xx

xx

xx

xx

xx

16. In the case of "State of J & K & Ors. v. Sajad Ahmed Mir reported in (2006) 5 SCC 766", the Hon'ble Supreme Court has considered the delay and laches in case of appointment on compassionate ground. By dismissing the claim for appointment on compassionate ground, which was made after a period of four and a half years of the death of the deceased employee, it was held that the appointment on compassionate ground is an exception to the general rule. An appointment to public offices should be made on the basis of competitive merits. It was further observed that once it is proved that inspite of the death of the breadwinner, the family survived and the substantial period is over, there is no need to make appointment on compassionate ground, at the cost of interests of several others ignoring the mandate of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

xx

xx

xx

xx

xx

21. In the present case also, as already indicated above, the petitioners approached the Tribunal after a lapse of almost 13 years from the date of death of the employee concerned. The observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of P. Venkatesh (supra) are squarely applicable with the facts of the instant case. For the sake of convenience, the relevant observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of P. Venkatesh (supra) are as under:

$$xx \qquad \qquad \qquad xx \qquad \qquad \qquad xx \qquad \qquad \qquad xx \qquad \qquad \qquad xx$$

24. Looking to the material available on the record, and after applying the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex



Court in the judgments referred in foregoing paras, we are of the considered opinion that the contentions put forward by the counsel for the petitioners, do not carry any merit, as the subsequent representations were made after a decade. Thus, this Court is not able to accept the claim of the petitioners for compassionate appointment after a great lapse of 17 years. Thus, the impugned order dated 19.08.2021 passed by the Tribunal warrants no interference by this Court.”

14. Keeping in view the above, the petitioner is not entitled for appointment on compassionate grounds after a lapse of period of more than 23 years from the date he attained majority i.e. 17.08.2002. Even otherwise, the claim of the petitioner has been rejected by the respondents, while deciding his legal notice, on 07.07.2017 and he approached this Court on 01.02.2021 i.e. after a lapse of more than three years. The position of law is well settled that appointment on compassionate basis is not an alternate source of recruitment nor does the consideration for such employment is a vested right, which can be exercised at any time in future.
15. For the reasons stated hereinabove, the present writ petition is dismissed, with no order as to costs.

16.03.2026
Kothiyal

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No