



2026:CGHC:3114

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 1339 of 2019

Girendra Ghosle, S/o late Shri Mahaveer Prasad Girendra, aged about 33 years, R/o Ward No.9, Bilha, Tahsil Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, New Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Deputy Inspector General of Police (Administration), New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Additional Inspector General of Police (Selection/ Recruitment), Police Headquarter, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate.

For Respondents : Mr. Ajay Kumrani, Panel Lawyer.

Single Bench:-

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

19/01/2026

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition questioning the impugned order dated 8-2-2018 by which his application for compassionate appointment has been rejected.



2. The petitioner's father, who was working as Constable in the Police Department, died in harness on 16-8-2008 pursuant to which the petitioner from time to time filed application for compassionate appointment but on account of his ineligibility or for not having requisite qualification, it was not considered and however, the application has been rejected on the ground of delay in filing the application.
3. Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, would submit that the application submitted by the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has wrongly been rejected, though he was fulfilling the criteria for compassionate appointment.
4. Mr. Ajay Kumrani, learned State counsel, would submit that after a delay of 15 years 9 months, it would be inappropriate to grant compassionate appointment to the petitioner.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and considered their rival submissions made herein-above and also gone through the material available on record.
6. The Supreme Court in the matter of **Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana and others**¹ has held that compassionate appointment cannot be granted after a lapse of reasonable time and cannot be claimed as a matter of right once the immediate crisis is over.

¹ (1994) 4 SCC 138



7. Similarly, in the matter of **Local Administration Department and another v. M. Selvanayagam alias Kumaravelu**², the Supreme Court has reiterated that an appointment made many years after the death of the employee, without assessing the immediate financial crisis, would be violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.
8. Furthermore, the petitioner's application for compassionate appointment has earlier been rejected on 4-2-2016 and 17-10-2016 which has not been assailed and accordingly it has become final, as such, on the ground of delay and after lapse of reasonable time, compassionate appointment cannot be granted, particularly, when his application has already been rejected on 4-2-2016 and 17-10-2016. In that view of the matter, I do not find any merit in this writ petition, it deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE

Soma

² (2011) 13 SCC 42