



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVP No. 12 of 2026

1 - Smt. Pooja Sahu D/o Late Shri Nandkumar Sahu, W/o Shri Narayan Sahu Aged About 25 Years R/o Village - Lawatara, Police Station And Tahsil - Berla, District - Bemetara (C.G.)

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

- 1** - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)
2 - The Sub-Divisional Officer Tandula Water Resources, Sub-Division No.4, Durg, District - Durg (C.G.)
3 - The Executive Engineer Tandula Water Resources, Sub-Division, Durg, District - Durg (C.G.)
4 - Smt. Devki Sahu W/o Late Shri Nandkumar Sahu Aged About 32 Years R/o Village - Kharra, Post - Kusmi, P.S. And Tahsil - Berla, District - Bemetara (C.G.) (Petitioner in WP(S) No.8466/2025)

... Respondent(s)

For Petitioner	:	Shri Bharat Rajput, Advocate.
For State	:	Shri Vinod Tekam, Govt. Advocate along with Shri Vikhyat Arora, Panel Lawyer.
For Respondent No.4	:	Shri Ajeet Kumar Yadav, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, J

Order on Board

22.01.2026

- 1.** The present Review application has been filed by the petitioner for recalling of the order dated 06.08.2025 passed by this court in WPS No.8466 of 2025.
- 2.** Facts of the case are that one Nand Kumar Sahu who was working as Peon with the respondents department died in harness on 13.04.2025. The present review petitioner as well as respondent No.4 claiming to be daughter and wife respectively of the deceased Nand Kumar Sahu, made their respective applications for compassionate appointment

before the respondent department, however, the respondent No.4 filed a writ petition being WPS No.8466 of 2025 without impleading the present review petitioner as party respondent, and got an order from this court on 06.08.2025 by which the respondent No.3 was directed to take a decision on the representation of the present respondent No.4 dated 02.07.2025 for grant of compassionate appointment on account of death of Nand Kumar Sahu within eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the said order. When the present review petitioner came into knowledge of the order dated 06.08.2025, she challenged the same before Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal No.828 of 2025 which was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to raise her grievance before the Single Judge and thereafter the present Review Petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that despite knowing rival claim of review petitioner with respect to departmental dues and rights of the deceased employee, without impleading the review petitioner herein as party respondent and suppressing all these facts, the writ petitioner filed the writ petition and obtained the order from this court. He would further submit that pursuant to the order passed by this court on 06.08.2025, the respondent authorities are keen to decide the application for grant of compassionate appointment in favour of the present respondent No.4 (writ petitioner). The review petitioner is the daughter of deceased and she has her right to be appointed on compassionate ground. Therefore, the order dated 06.08.2025 passed in WPS No.8466 of 2025 may be recalled and the said writ petition

may be decided on merits by impleading the present review petitioner as party respondent.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent No.4 would submit that the writ petitioner was not in knowledge about the rival claim of the review petitioner and she was pursuing her remedy before the authorities. When the authorities have not decided her application, she filed the writ petition in which a direction was issued to consider the application of the writ petitioner in accordance with law. There is no adverse order passed by the court against the review petitioner and it is for the authorities concerned to decide the application of the writ petitioner in accordance with law. Therefore, the order impugned cannot be recalled and the review petition is liable to be dismissed.
5. I have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the material annexed with the review petition as well as writ petition.
6. From perusal of the pleadings of the writ petition it transpires that the present review petitioner was not made as party respondent in the writ petition. It further transpires from document Annexure P/4 enclosed at page No.18 of the writ petition that there was rival claim of one Pooja Sahu with respect to departmental dues and other service benefits of the deceased Nand Kumar Sahu. In the said document it is also alleged that Pooja Sahu has obtained signature from the writ petitioner keeping her in dark, yet she was not made party respondent in the writ petition. Thus, considering rival claims of writ petitioner as well as the present review petitioner, issuing direction to respondent authorities to consider the representation of the writ petitioner in accordance with law, may prejudice the ultimate outcome of the consideration of the

authorities concerned, that too without hearing the present review petitioner.

7. Consequently, the order dated 06.08.2025 passed by this court in WPS No.8466 of 2025 is recalled and the said writ petition WPS No.8466 of 2025 is restored to its original number. Registry is directed to list WPS No.8466 of 2025 before the appropriate Bench having roster.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

inder