



CGHC010336422019



2026:CGHC:31493

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 8356 of 2019**

**1 - Rupesh Kumar Verma S/o Late Bajrang Verma Aged About 26 Years
R/o Village Hardikala Tona, Ward No. 6, Police Station Sirgitti, District
Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh**

... Petitioner(s)**versus**

**1 - Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Co.Ltd. (Cspdcl), Through The
Chairman, Shed No. 8, Chhattisgarh State Power Company Campus,
Daganiya, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur,
Chhattisgarh**

**2 - Executive Engineer Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company
Limited (Cspdcl), Office Of Executive Engineer, Nagar Sambhag Poorva
(Torwa), Bilaspur, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur,
Chhattisgarh**

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Ms. Aditi Joshi, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Dr. Veena Nair on behalf of Mr. K.R. Nair,
Advocates

SB – Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order on Board****23/07/2026**

1. This writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner against the impugned order dated 15/07/2019 (Annexure P/1) passed by respondent No. 2 whereby petitioner's application for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's father died in harness on 14/02/2007 while working as Attendant Grade – II and after passing Class VIII, petitioner moved an application for compassionate appointment on 18/06/2012, however, ultimately by passing the impugned order, the respondents have rejected petitioner's application for grant of compassionate appointment on the ground of delay, which is unsustainable and bad in law.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents supports the impugned order and submits that petitioner moved the application for grant of compassionate appointment on 18/06/2012 i.e. after five years of the death of his father, as such, his application has rightly been rejected and the instant writ petition is liable to be dismissed.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submissions made herein-above and perused the record.

5. A careful perusal of the impugned order shows that petitioner's application for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected by the respondents on the ground of delay holding that according to the Circular No. 830 dated 11/04/2018, as per clause 10, the application for compassionate appointment has to be filed within 3 years from the date of death of the employee and since petitioner's application was not filed within the said period, it has been rejected on the ground of delay, which in my considered opinion, is in accordance with law. Even otherwise, the fact remains that petitioner's father died on 14/02/2007 and at this stage, after a period of almost twenty years, it would not be appropriate to direct the respondents to grant compassionate appointment to the petitioner. I do not find any merit in this writ petition.
6. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed leaving the parties to bear their own cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)

JUDGE

Harneet