

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7569/2026

Rajesh Kumar Palsania Son Of Gheesa Lal Palsania, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 3, Kerali Road, Ajeetgarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Director, Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Joint Director (Administration) Secondary Education, Rajasthan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. District Education Officer (Headquarter), Secondary Education Jaipur Rural
5. Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Amarsar, Tehsil Shahpura, Jaipur

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Pradeep Kalwania
For Respondent(s)	:	

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHIRANIA

Order

27/04/2026

1. The petitioner has approached this Court with the grievance that the respondents have issued the impugned order dated 24.01.2025, whereby he has been denied appointment on compassionate basis on the ground of delay in filing of application.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, being the adopted son, is legally entitled for the compassionate appointment under the Rajasthan Compassionate

Appointment of Dependants of Deceased Government Servants Rules, 1996, however, the respondents have not considered the same while contemplating the application of the petitioner.

3. This Court heard learned counsel for the petitioner and noted that in the earlier round, the petitioner had approached this Court with the same grievances by way of S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9268/2005, which came to be dismissed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 24.11.2005. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the Division Bench by filing Special Appeal Writ No.572/2007, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 01.05.2008, wherein the Division Bench passed the following order:-

"Heard counsel for the appellant.

Delay in filing the appeal is condoned.

The matter pertains to appointment on compassionate ground.

It appears from the material on record that on account of death of husband of appellant no.1 on 30th May, 1998, she was given appointment on compassionate ground. The same, however, was declined and she requested the authorities to appoint her adopted son on attaining majority. The prayer of the appellant, however, was rejected.

Firstly, appointment on compassionate ground was given to the appellant on account of death of the bread earner, but she refused to accept the same and thereafter the family survived for about ten years. The whole object of appointment on compassionate ground thus vanishes.

So far the alternative question raised in this appeal to provide appointment to the

adopted son is concerned, it appears that adoption deed was got registered on 9th June, 1998, admittedly after death of the deceased. According to the case of the appellant, her husband died in harness on 30th May, 1998, whereas the deed of adoption was registered in the month of June, 1998. The question of adoption, therefore, also appears to be doubtful and no credence should be given to the adoption as alleged.

For the reasons aforementioned, therefore, we find no reason to interfere with the order impugned.

This appeal is accordingly dismissed."

4. Now, after passing of the aforementioned order, the petitioner has again approached this Court after 2008 with the grievance that his application for compassionate appointment has been dismissed by the respondent vide impugned order dated 24.01.2025 on the ground of delay in filing the application.

5. This Court, after considering the complete pleadings and documents finds that the act of petitioner of filing the present writ petition is a sheer wastage of precious judicial time of the Court. Once the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court and Division Bench in the previous rounds of litigation had already examined the claim of compassionate appointment of the petitioner, therefore, again and again approaching this Court with the same grievance is intentional and a fruitless endeavor on the part of the petitioner. Further, the Special Appeal Writ was also dismissed in the year 2008 and now, the petitioner has approached this Court after more than 17-18 years. Despite knowing the settled law in regard to consideration and appointment on compassionate basis, the

petitioner has filed the instant writ petition which, in the opinion of the Court, deserves to be dismissed with cost.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed with a cost of Rs.5,000/- which shall be deposited by the petitioner to the Rajasthan High Court Bar Association for the welfare of the advocates within a period of 30 days from the date of passing of this order.

7. List this matter on 18.05.2026 for compliance of the order.

(RAVI CHIRANIA),J

Dushyant/34