2026:AHC:207211

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 16222 of 2026

Rahul Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Canara Bank And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Rakesh Kumar Mishra, Shiv Prakash
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Krishna Mohan Asthana

Court No. - 32

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 29.09.2023, whereby the representation submitted on his behalf seeking appointment on compassionate grounds has been rejected.

3. As per the endorsement made by the Reporting Section, there is a delay of 1003 days in filing the instant petition. The cause for delay explained in the instant petition is sufficient and to the satisfaction of the Court. As such, the delay in filing the instant writ petition is hereby condoned.

4. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the father of the petitioner died in harness on 19.12.2021 while serving as a Class-IV employee. The representation submitted by the petitioner seeking compassionate appointment has been rejected in a perfunctory manner without assigning any cogent reason.

5. Learned Counsel appearing for the respondent-Bank has vehemently opposed the submissions advanced by learned Counsel for the petitioner.

6. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned Counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the record, it is evident that the respondent-Bank has rejected the representation submitted by the petitioner seeking appointment on compassionate grounds in a cursory manner, without passing a reasoned and speaking order. While rejecting the application submitted by the petitioner, the only reason assigned is that the financial condition of the dependent family is satisfactory. Whereas, as per case of the petitioner, all

family members were dependents on the salary of the deceased employee. The grounds urged by the petitioner in support of his claim for compassionate appointment have not been duly considered.

7. Accordingly, this Court is of the considered view that the impugned order dated 29.09.2023 passed by the respondent-Bank deserves to be revisited by the authorities competent in the light of the grounds taken by the petitioner to substantiate his claim for compassionate appointment.

8. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the instant petition pending. Accordingly, this Court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the claim of the present petitioner for compassionate appointment, with a direction that the competent authority shall revisit the impugned order dated 29.09.2023 and reconsider the claim of the petitioner in accordance with law by passing a reasoned and speaking order, expeditiously, preferably within a period of **three months** from the date of production of a certified copy of this order.

9. It is clarified that the impugned order dated 29.09.2023 shall abide by the decision to be taken by the competent authority pursuant to this order.

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

October 5, 2026
vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
VINOD KUMAR GOSWAMI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad