
(2006) 04 GAU CK 0010
In the Gauhati High Court

Naorem Jummy Meitei

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Manipur and Anr.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 13-04-2006

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2006) 04 GAU CK 0010

Hon'ble Judges : T.Nanda Kumar Singh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : H.Dijen, A.Jagat Chandra Singh, Advocates appearing for Parties

Judgement

1. Heard Mr. H. Dijen, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Mr. A. Jagatchandra, learned senior GA appearing on behalf of the respondents.

[2] Considering the innocuous prayer made in the present writ petition, the same is disposed of at this stage.

[3] The fact of the case is very short and simple. According to the petitioner, petitioner's father was working as a regular VLW (Village Level Worker) in the Department of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj, Government of Manipur; and while on election duty, he was killed on 20.2.2002 in an ambush at Laikhong Village by unknown armed extremists. It is also case of the petitioner that there is a scheme framed by the Government of Manipur for appointment of the dependants of the Government employee who died in harness on compassionate ground, and he is also eligible for appointment under the said scheme i.e. Dieinharness of the Government of Manipur.

[4] The petitioner's father was the sole earning member of the family and as such after the death of his father; members of the petitioner's family are left in a very bad financial condition. It is also said that none of the members of petitioner's family are employed in the service of the Government of Manipur or in the service of the Central Government. After the death of his father he filed a representation dated 3.4.2002 to the Block Development Officer, Saddar Hills East, Saikul for appointment of the petitioner under the Dieinharness scheme to

any suitable post. The said application for appointment under the Dieinharness scheme had been processed by the Block Development Officer under his letter dated 4.4.2002 to the Director, Rural Development & Panchayati Raj, Manipur. But the case for appointment of the petitioner under the Dieinharness has not yet finalized and it is still pending with the respondents. Such being the situation, the petitioner is filing the present writ petition for a direction to the respondents to consider and dispose of the said representation for appointment under the Dieinharness scheme.

[5] Taking into consideration of the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner as well as perusal of the case of the petitioner in the present writ petition and documents annexed thereto, this writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondents to consider the said application of the petitioner for appointment under the Dieinharness scheme prepared by the Government of Manipur, if he is eligible, to any post as expeditiously as possible subject to the seniority position of the petitioner in the list of the applicants for appointment under the Dieinharness scheme maintained by the concerned department. It is made clear that while considering the case for appointment under the Dieinharness, recommendation made by the Director of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj under his letter dated 8.12.2003 shall be taken into consideration.

With the above observation and direction writ petition is disposed of.