



2026:CGHC:23639-DB



2026:CGHC:23639-DB

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WA No. 370 of 2026**

Henri Rangari S/o- Late Ashok Rangari Aged About 21 Years R/o-
Abadipara, Ward No. 01, Riwagahan, Post - Doma, District-Dhamtari
Chhattisgarh

... Appellant(s)**versus**

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department of Revenue
And Disaster Management Mahanadi Bhawan, Nawa Raipur, Atal
Nagar, District-Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Collector, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
3. Collector (Finance Department), District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.
4. Tehsildar, Kurud, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

...Respondent(s)

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	:	Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, Senior Advocate, assisted by Mr. Kabeer Kalwani, Advocate.
For Respondents/State	:	Mr. Prasun Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General.



Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

15.06.2026

1. Heard Mr. Manoj Paranjpe, learned Senior Advocate, assisted by Mr. Kabeer Kalwani, learned counsel appearing for the appellant, and Mr. Prasun Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General appearing for the State/respondents, on I.A. No. 1 of 2026, an application seeking condonation of delay.

2. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and upon considering the reasons assigned in the application, this Court is satisfied that sufficient cause has been shown for condonation of delay. Accordingly, I.A. No. 1 of 2026 is allowed and the delay of 68 days in filing the appeal is hereby condoned.

3. The present intra-Court appeal has been preferred by the appellant/writ petitioner assailing the orders dated **28.11.2025** and **03.03.2026** passed by the learned Single Judge in **WPS No. 13450 of 2025** (*Henri Rangari v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*) and **MCC No. 38 of 2026** (*Henri Rangari v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*), whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant was dismissed and the MCC was disposed of.

4. Learned Senior Advocate for the appellant submits that the



appellant is the son of Late Ashok Kumar Rangari, who was working as Assistant Grade-II in the Tehsil Office, Kurud, District Dhamtari and died in harness on 05.11.2024. The deceased was the sole breadwinner of the family and was survived by his widow Motim Bai, the appellant, and his sister Satya Dey Rangari. The appellant and his mother were wholly dependent upon the income of the deceased employee.

5. It is further submitted by the learned Senior Advocate, appearing for the appellant that immediately after the death of the deceased employee, the appellant applied for compassionate appointment. During the course of inquiry, the appellant's elder step-brother, Virendra Bahadur Rangari, specifically informed the authorities that he had been residing separately at Jagdalpur with his own family for several years, was not dependent upon the deceased employee, and had no objection to grant of compassionate appointment in favour of the appellant. He also submits that despite the aforesaid undisputed facts, the District Level Compassionate Appointment Committee rejected the appellant's claim solely on the ground that Virendra Bahadur Rangari is serving in Government service. The said decision was subsequently affirmed by the learned Single Judge.

6. It is further contended by the learned Senior Advocate, appearing for the appellant that the learned Single Judge failed to appreciate the definition of "family" contained in Notification dated 06.08.2007 issued by the Finance Department, Government of Chhattisgarh. The said notification clearly provides that family members must be residing with



and wholly dependent upon the Government servant. The appellant's elder step-brother has been residing separately since the year 2006, has his own independent source of income, and maintains his separate family. Therefore, he cannot be treated as a dependent family member of the deceased employee for the purpose of denying compassionate appointment to the appellant. He further submits that the object of compassionate appointment is to provide immediate financial assistance to the family of a deceased employee facing hardship due to the sudden loss of its sole earning member. In the present case, the appellant is a young student aged about 21 years, his mother is a widow, and his sister is also dependent upon the family. The family has been left without any effective source of livelihood after the death of the deceased employee.

7. It is further stated by the learned Senior Advocate that even under Notification dated 18.11.2024, a person can be treated as dependent only if his income does not exceed the prescribed limit. The appellant satisfies the requirement of dependency, whereas Virendra Bahadur Rangari, being a Government officer drawing regular salary and residing separately, cannot be considered a dependent of the deceased employee. He also places reliance upon the decision of the High Court of Chhattisgarh in ***Ghanshyam Devdas v. State of Chhattisgarh & Others*** [WPS No.7681 of 2023], wherein the authorities were directed to reconsider the claim for compassionate appointment in a similar factual situation involving members of a blended family. Reliance is also placed upon the judgment of the High Court of Karnataka in ***Smt.***



Laxmibai Shivarai Bhajantri v. State of Karnataka & Others [WP

No.105078 of 2024], wherein it was held that compassionate appointment can be claimed only by persons who were actually dependent upon the deceased employee.

8. It is, therefore, submitted that the authorities as well as the learned Single Judge have erred in treating Virendra Bahadur Rangari as a relevant dependent family member merely because of his relationship with the deceased, without considering the undisputed fact that he was living separately and was not dependent upon the deceased employee. Consequently, the rejection of the appellant's claim defeats the very object of the compassionate appointment scheme and has resulted in grave prejudice to the appellant and his dependent family members.

9. Accordingly, it is prayed that the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge, as well as the orders rejecting the appellant's claim for compassionate appointment, be set aside and the respondents be directed to reconsider the appellant's case for compassionate appointment in accordance with law.

10. *Per contra*, learned State counsel supports the impugned orders and submits that the appellant's claim has rightly been rejected in view of Clause 6(A) of the Compassionate Appointment Policy, 2013 (for short, 'Policy of 2013'), as the appellant's brother, Virendra Bahadur Rangari, is admittedly in Government service.

11. Learned State counsel further submits that the issue is no longer



res integra and stands concluded by the Division Bench judgment of this Court in ***State of Chhattisgarh & Others v. Kevra Bai Markandey & Another (WA No.91 of 2022 decided on 23.02.2022)***, wherein, after considering Clause 5 and Clause 6(A) of the Policy of 2013 and the earlier Division Bench decision in ***State of Chhattisgarh & Others v. Smt. Muniya Mukharjee (WA No.33 of 2022 decided on 18.02.2022)***, it was held that if any member of the family of the deceased employee is already in Government service, the other family members would not be entitled to compassionate appointment. It is, therefore, submitted that the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed the writ petition and subsequently disposed of the MCC and no interference is called for in the present appeal.

12. We have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and have carefully perused the material available on record.

13. The undisputed facts reveal that the appellant sought compassionate appointment consequent upon the death of his father, Late Ashok Kumar Rangari, who died while in service on 05.11.2024. The claim of the appellant came to be rejected by the competent authorities on the ground that one of the sons of the deceased employee, namely Virendra Bahadur Rangari, is already serving in Government service and, therefore, in view of Clause 6(A) of the Policy of 2013, the appellant is not entitled to compassionate appointment.

14. The principal contention advanced on behalf of the appellant is that Virendra Bahadur Rangari has been residing separately for a long



period, is maintaining his own family and was not dependent upon the deceased employee. Therefore, according to the appellant, he ought not to have been treated as a member of the family for the purpose of applying the disqualification contained in Clause 6(A) of the Policy.

15. The aforesaid submission cannot be accepted in view of the law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Kevra Bai Markandey*** (supra). In the said decision, after considering the provisions of the Policy of 2013, particularly Clauses 5 and 6(A), and the earlier judgment rendered in ***Smt. Muniya Mukharjee*** (supra), it has been categorically held that if any member of the family of the deceased employee, as contemplated under the scheme, is already in Government service, the other members of the family would not be entitled to compassionate appointment.

16. The learned Single Judge has considered the provisions of Clause 6(A) of the Policy of 2013 as well as Clause 32 of Rule 9 of the Fundamental Rules and has recorded a finding that the brother of the appellant, who is admittedly in Government service, falls within the ambit of the family of the deceased employee. The learned Single Judge has also placed reliance upon the binding judgment of the Division Bench in ***Kevra Bai Markandey*** (supra) and upheld the rejection of the appellant's claim.

17. We find no infirmity in the view so taken by the learned Single Judge. Once it is admitted that Virendra Bahadur Rangari, who is the son of the deceased employee, is already holding a Government post,



the bar contained in Clause 6(A) of the Policy of 2013 becomes operative. The policy does not carve out any exception on the ground that such family member is residing separately or is not dependent upon the deceased employee.

18. It is trite law that compassionate appointment is an exception to the normal rule of recruitment and cannot be claimed as a matter of right. Such appointment can be granted only in strict accordance with the scheme governing the field. The Court cannot ignore or dilute the express conditions prescribed under the policy.

19. In the considered opinion of this Court, the learned Single Judge has rightly dismissed WPS No.13450 of 2025 by applying the law laid down by the Division Bench of this Court. We also find no error in the order dated 03.03.2026 passed in MCC No.38 of 2026.

20. Consequently, finding no merit in the present writ appeal, the same deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**. The orders dated 28.11.2025 passed in WPS No.13450 of 2025 and dated 03.03.2026 passed in MCC No.38 of 2026 are affirmed.

21. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice