



2026:CGHC:4250

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 9867 of 2019

Ved Prakash Jasuja, S/o late Atma Prakash Jasuja, aged about 44 years, R/o Darbaritoli, Jashpurnagar, District Jashpur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner

versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Higher Education Department, Atal Nagar, Mantralaya, New Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. The Director, Directorate of Higher Education, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. The Principal, Govt. Arts and Science College, Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Shobhit Koshta, Advocate.

For Respondents : Mr. Ajay Kumrani, Panel Lawyer.

Single Bench:-

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

23/01/2026

1. The petitioner's father died in harness on 3-9-1996 while working as a Government servant. His son i.e. the petitioner herein made an application for compassionate appointment on 23-7-2002 which was not pressed and remained pending and again the same was reiterated by filing another application on 13-12-2018. Now, the instant writ petition has been filed on 21-11-2019 for directing the respondents to



consider the case of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment.

2. Mr. Shobhit Koshta, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, would submit that the application of the petitioner for compassionate appointment ought to have been decided but the same has not been decided.
3. Mr. Ajay Kumrani, learned State counsel, would submit that now, since the year 1996 when the petitioner's father died in harness, more than 29 years have elapsed and therefore no useful purpose will be served in granting compassionate appointment to the petitioner.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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

¹ (1994) 4 SCC 138

² (2011) 13 SCC 42



financial crisis, would be violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

7. Since more than 29 years had already elapsed and the petitioner has survived for fairly long time and attained the age of 50 years, thus crossed the required age limit for appointment, therefore, no useful purpose will be served in directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment. As such, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed and it is accordingly dismissed, as the petitioner has approached the Court for compassionate appointment with a great delay. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
JUDGE