

(2009) 11 GUJ CK 0091
In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : Special Civil Application No's. 11242, 11243, 11244 to 11251 and 11252 of 2009

Thakore Narendrakumar Juhaji

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Gujarat and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 02-11-2009

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2009) 11 GUJ CK 0091

Hon'ble Judges : Jayant M. Patel, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Ramnandan Singh, for the Appellant; Neeraj Soni, AGP in SCA Nos. 11243 to 11247 of 2009 and Moxa Thakkar, AGP for Respondent No. 1 in SCA Nos. 11242 and 11248 to 11252 of 2009, for the Respondent

Judgement

Jayant Patel, J.—Since the group of Special Civil Application No. 11243 to 11253 of 2009 was listed and two matters were left out and not listed in today's board, with the request of the learned Counsel for both the sides the papers of the said two matters were called for and the learned Counsel appearing for both the sides have requested that the said matters may also be considered simultaneously. Hence, considered accordingly.

2. Rule. Mr.Soni as well as Ms. Moxa Thakkar, learned AGPs waive service of notice of rule in respective petitions. With the consent of the learned Counsel appearing for he petitioners as well as the learned AGPs, the matters are finally heard today.

3. As in all the matters more or less common questions are involved, except there is change in the amount of pensions and other retrial benefits of the concerned deceased employees, they are being considered together by this common judgement.

4. In all the petitions, the petitioners who are members of the family of the deceased Government/Panchayat Servants have approached this Court for

challenging the order passed by the concerned authority denying the compassionate appointment to the petitioners and the petitioners have also prayed to direct the respondent authorities to reconsider the case of the petitioners for giving appointment on compassionate ground.

5. The short facts of the case appears to be that the petitioners are members of the family of the deceased employees. On account of the death of all the concerned deceased employees, prior to reaching the age of superannuation, the petitioners concerned had applied for compassionate appointment. The matter was considered by the District Panchayat and other authorities. Thereafter the same was forwarded to the State Government. The factual position of each case appears as under:

-----							Sr.
Number of the petition Amount of Family Pension Amount of Retiral Benefits							
-----							1.
SCA	11243	of	2009	Rs.	3,250/-	Rs.	5,60,913/-
-----							2.
SCA	11244	of	2009	Rs.	6,843/-	Rs.	8,57,587/-
-----							3.
SCA	11245	of	2009	Rs.	6,463/-	Rs.7,41,189/- + Rs.	1,01,341/- from L.I.C.
-----							4.
SCA	11246	of	2009	Rs.	7,284/-	Rs.	11,66,481/-
-----							5.
SCA	11247	of	2009	Rs.	5,569/-	Rs.	5,93,360/-
-----							6.
SCA	11248	of	2009	Rs.	4,591/-	Rs.	6,11,039/-
-----							7.
SCA	11249	of	2009	Rs.	7,168/-	Rs.	9,31,162/-
-----							8.
SCA	11250	of	2009	Rs.	6,299/-	Rs.	8,06,492/-
-----							9.
SCA	11251	of	2009	Rs.	5,719/-	Rs.	7,91,158/-
-----							10.
SCA	11252	of	2009	Rs.	5,308/-	Rs. 8,16,309/- + Rs.	3,13,815/- from L.I.C.
-----							11.
SCA	11242	of	2009	Rs.	7,951/-	Rs.	8,48,945/-

6. It appears that thereafter the State Government has considered the matter and it is found that in view of the regular payment of pension as referred to hereinabove in the tabular statement and the retiral benefits paid to the family members of the concerned employees, it cannot be said that the condition of the families of the deceased employees would be pitiable, therefore, the proposal for offering compassionate appointment is not accepted. The aforesaid decision of the State Government have been communicated by the District Development

Officer/concerned Authority to the concerned petitioners. It is under these circumstances, the present petitions before this Court.

7. Heard Mr.Ramnandan Singh, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr.Soni and Ms.Moxa Thakkar, learned AGPs for respondent State in the respective petitions.

8. As such certain issues, which arise for consideration in the present petitions, are covered by the decision of this Court in the case of Jayesh J. Puwar v. General Manager reported at 2003 GHCJ 1-1043 (SCA No. 8675 of 2002), as well as the decision of this Court in the case of Diptiben D. Jadhav v. State of Gujarat reported at 2007(0) GLHEL-HC 219783 (SCA No. 4729 of 2007). In the decision of this Court in the case of Jayesh J. Puwar (supra), the proposal for compassionate appointment was denied on the ground of pension being paid and the retiral benefits paid to the concerned Government employee. This Court, after considering the submission, observed at paragraph 8 as under:

8. Considering the above, I am of the view that so far as the payment of terminal benefits are concerned, the same is on account of statutory obligation on the part of the employer and it cannot be a set off for negating the claim for appointment on compassionate ground. It may be that after excluding the amount of family pension and after excluding the amount of terminal benefits, the employer may consider the case for appointment on compassionate ground, keeping in view the availability of post, qualification of the dependent, etc., who applied for appointment on compassionate ground but the appointment on compassionate ground cannot be denied merely on the ground that the family of the deceased is receiving income of family pension and or that it has received the amount by way of terminal benefits.

9. In the decision of this Court in the case of Diptiben D. Jadhav (supra), it was, inter alia, observed at paragraph 5 as under:

5. Concerning the second ground of financial condition, due to the payment of retiral benefits is concerned, such was provided in the earlier resolution and ultimately vide resolution dated 10.3.2000 the income limit is deleted and fresh instructions are issued. Therefore, the ground mentioned by the State Government for rejecting the application due to payment of retiral benefits is extraneous to the Government Policy and the resolution and, therefore, cannot be sustained.

10. This Court further observed at paragraph 7 as under:

7. It deserves to be recorded that the essential purpose of compassionate appointment is to give benefit to the family members of the deceased government employee at the earliest for financial support to the family. Therefore, such application is required to be decided as early as possible. Otherwise, the very purpose of giving compassionate appointment would be frustrated.

11. It is the aforesaid findings and observations made by this Court in the above referred decisions pressed in service by the learned Counsel for the petitioners. It was submitted, that the retiral benefits including the family pension is not at all required to be considered and the matter deserves to be examined from the other aspects, which have not been done in the present case, therefore, this Court may quash the decision and may direct the State Government to reconsider the matter, excluding the income of family pension and the retiral benefits.

12. Whereas, the learned AGPs contended that even if the income limit is excluded for consideration the cause of compassionate appointment, the essential purpose is to provide financial support for survival of the family and the income of the family is required to be considered and such would include the family pension and the retiral benefits. Therefore, the learned AGPs have supported the order passed by the State Government, whereby the compassionate appointment have been denied.

13. It appears to this Court that as such in view of the aforesaid decision, the statutory obligation which has been discharged by the State Government on account of the death of the concerned employees cannot be treated as a set off for negating the claim on compassionate ground, but at the same time, the learned AGPs are right in contending, to the extent, that the essential purpose of extending the benefits of compassionate appointment is to see that the family gets financial support for survival, hence, the financial condition of the family may have the relevance to that extent. Therefore, it appears that while considering the financial condition of the family, the State Government can take into consideration the salary or the minimum wage being offered for the post in question for which compassionate appointment is prayed. For example, in a given case, if the qualification of the applicant meets with Class-IV employee, then in that case the State Government has to take into consideration the salary at the entry point of such Class-IV employee and thereafter to consider as to whether the same meets with the quantum of family pension, which is being received by the family members of the deceased employee or not. If minimum scale or salary is available by way of family pension, it may be one of the relevant circumstances to consider as to whether the family has financial support for survival or not. There may be other relevant circumstance to be taken into consideration by the concerned authority, including the availability of the post, policy of the Government for payment of salary, etc. Hence, it appears that such aspects, though were required to be taken into consideration by the State Government, have not been taken into consideration and only by relying upon the income of the pension without taking into consideration the minimum salary for the post in question the compassionate appointment has been denied.

14. In view of the aforesaid, the impugned decision can be said as without proper application of mind, hence, deserves to be quashed and set aside. Therefore, they are quashed and set aside. It is also directed that the concerned

authority/DDO, as the case may be, shall forward the proposal once again on the basis of the present decision of this Court to the State Government within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order and the State Government thereafter shall decide the matter afresh and keeping in view all the observations made hereinabove and also in accordance with law, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the proposal from DDO/concerned authority and the decision shall be communicated to the petitioners.

15. The petitions are partly allowed to the aforesaid extent. Rule made absolute accordingly. No order as to costs.