IN THE MAHARASHTRA ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL, MUMBAI

ORIGINAL APPLICATION NO.81 OF 2024

DISTRICT : SOLAPUR SUB : Compassionate Appt.

Shri Rohan Chincholappa Adakul,)
Aged 28 Years, Occ. Nil, R/o.158,)
Sanjay Nagar, Kumtha Naka, Solapur.) Applicant

Versus

The Executive Engineer, Public Works)
Division, Solapur, having office at Seven)
Roads, opp. Karigal Petrol Pump,)
Solapur 3.) Respondents

Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant.

Shri A. J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondents.

CORAM	:	Hon'ble Shri M. A. Lovekar, Hon'ble Member (J)
Reserved on	:	15.01.2025
Pronounced on	:	17.01.2025

JUDGEMENT

Heard Shri A. V. Bandiwadekar, learned Advocate for the Applicant and Shri A.J. Chougule, learned Presenting Officer for the Respondent.

2. Chincholappa, Father of the Applicant was employed as 'Mazdoor' in the Respondent department. He died in harness on 06.07.2004. whereupon his wife Smt. Padmini (Mother of the Applicant) applied for appointment on compassionate ground on 16.11.2004. By communication dated 03.07.2008, she was informed that on account of attaining 40 years of age, her name was deleted from the waiting list. At that time, the Applicant was minor. His date of birth is 02.09.1995.

After attaining majority, on 27.05.2016, he applied for appointment on compassionate ground in place of his mother. On 29.07.2021, he submitted a reminder as nothing was informed to him. In respect of letter dated 27.09.2021 written by the Superintending Engineer, Public Works Circle, Kolhapur to the Respondent, the Respondent did not take any decision for appointing the Applicant on compassionate ground. Therefore, the Applicant sent a reminder dated 10.08.2023 to the Respondent in response to which the impugned order was passed on 01.09.2023 stating therein that appointment on compassionate ground was not a heritable right, it could not be given after lapse of considerable period from the date of death of the employee, and there was no enabling provision for substitution as sought by the Applicant. Hence, this Original Application.

3. In his reply, the Respondent has reiterated the grounds which were set out in the impugned order.

4. The issue involved in the Original Application has been decided by a Full Bench of the Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of Kalpana
Wd/O Vilas Taram And Another vs State Of Maharashtra & Others,
2024 (4) Mh.L.J 312. In this ruling, it is held :-

Sr.	Questions	Answers
No.		
i)	Considering the object of compassionate	The view taken in the case of
	appointment, to provide immediate succour to	Dnyaneshwar Musane (supra) by
	the family of the deceased employee who dies	the Division Bench of this Court
	in harness, as is spelt out in Umesh Kumar	and other similar matters is
	<u>Nagpal</u> (supra), <u>Nilima Raju Khapekar</u> (supra)	correct and is in consonance
	and Debabrata Tiwari (supra), whether the	with the object of compassionate
	view taken in Dnyaneshwar Musane (supra)	appointment spelt out in Umesh
	and in other similar matters as indicated	Kumar Nagpal (supra), Nilima
	above would be correct?	Raju Khapekar (supra) and
		Debabrata Tiwari (supra)

ii)	ii) Whether the policies of the State, which	a) Maintaining a wait list of
	provide for creating a wait list of the	candidates for compassionate
	candidates for compassionate appointment	appointments is not contrary to
	and in some cases permit substitution, even	the object and purpose for which
	on account of crossing a particular age limit of	a compassionate appointment
	45 years is contrary to the object and purpose	must be granted.
	for which a compassionate apportionment has to be granted?	b) Seeking substitution of the name of another member in place of a member who has applied on account of crossing the age limit of 45 years is not contrary to the object and purpose for which compassionate appointment must be granted.

5. In view of the legal position stated as above, the impugned order is quashed and set aside. The Respondent is directed to include name of the Applicant in the waiting list for appointment on compassionate ground if he is found to be otherwise eligible, within one month from today, and proceed further in accordance with relevant rules.

6. The Original Application is allowed in these terms with no order as to costs.

Sd/-(M. A. Lovekar) Member (J)

Place: Mumbai Date: 17.01.2025 Dictation taken by: V. S. Mane D:\VSM\VSO\2025\Judgment 2025\0.A.81 of 2024 comp. appt..doc