



2026:CGHC:14804



2026:CGHC:14804

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 438 of 2022

- Chandrakant Mahobia S/o Ramesh Kumar Mahobia Aged About 23 Years
R/o Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Education Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. District Education Officer Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
3. Block Education Officer Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Ankush Soni, Advocate holding the brief of Mr. Pramod Ramteke, Advocate
For State	: Mr. Abhishek Singh, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rakesh Mohan Pandey

Order on Board

30.03.2026

1. By way of this petition, the petitioner has sought the following relief(s):-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash/set-aside the impugned order dated 28-12-2021 (Annexure P-1) passed by the respondent No. 2.

10.2 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the respondent authorities to grant compassionate appointment to the petitioner in the respondent department in lieu of his mother, who died during the service period.



10.3 That, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief, as it may deem-fit and appropriate.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the mother of the petitioner, namely, Madhuri Tamboli was Head Master in the Primary School, Navagaon, Block Chhuikhadan, District Rajnandgaon, who died in harness on 06.01.2017. He would contend that the petitioner was adopted by the deceased through an adoption-deed dated 10.01.2007. He would contend that said adoption-deed was registered on 18.02.2020. It is argued that an application for compassionate appointment was moved by the petitioner on 04.09.2020 and it has been rejected vide order dated 28.10.2021 by District Education Officer, Rajnandgaon on non-existing grounds. He would submit that the petitioner is adopted son of the deceased, and thus, according to policy of 2013, he is entitled for compassionate appointment.
3. On the other hand, Mr. Abhishek Singh would oppose. He would submit that deceased Government servant is survived by her husband and a daughter, but they did not approach the respondent authorities claiming therein compassionate appointment. He would submit that the petitioner has claimed compassionate appointment pursuant to adoption-deed dated 10.01.2007, which was registered subsequently on 18.02.2020 after death of Government servant. He would submit that respondent No. 2 has rightly rejected the application.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents placed on record.
5. In the service record, names of husband and daughter of the deceased were entered. The petitioner has claimed compassionate appointment on the basis



of adoption-deed. It is not in dispute that it was registered after death of Government servant on 18.02.2020. The respondent No. 2 has rejected the application moved by the petitioner on the ground that name of the petitioner is not mentioned in the service record and adoption-deed was registered after death of the Government servant. The writ petition is liable to be dismissed on one more ground that the husband and daughter of the Government servant did not approach the respondent authorities rather application has been moved by an adopted son. Accordingly, this petition fails and is hereby **dismissed.**

Sd/-
(**Rakesh Mohan Pandey**)
JUDGE

Siddhant