WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'bleMrs.UrmitaDatta (Sen), Member(J) The Hon'bleMr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No <u>- OA-978 of 2018.</u>

6 : 121	NurAlam Vs The State of West Bengal & Others.	Office action with data
Serial No. and Date of order.1	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
05	For the Applicant : Md. Ahsanussman, Advocate.	
14-08-2019	For the State Respondent : Mr. A. De, Nos. 1,3,5,6,7& 8 Departmental Representative.	
	As per the applicant, his father died on	
	19-03-2001, thereafter he approached before	
	the authority for compassionate appointment	
	on 06-12-2017. However, the respondent	
	authority had rejected his case vide order dated	
	12-10-2018 (Annexure – P/10) on the ground	
	that the applicant's father died on 19-03-2001	
	and he approached for compassionate	
	appointment after 16 years. In the mean time,	
	the claim for compassionate appointment of the	
	applicant's mother was rejected by the	
	authority way back in 2001 after considering	
	the financial condition. Being aggrieved with,	
	he has filed the instant application.	
	As per the applicant, his mother	
	earlier approached the authority for	

Form No.	••••
----------	------

Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Others.

NurAlam

Case No.OA-978 of 2018

Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary
	compassionate appointment. However she was	3
	never communicated with any decision. Further	
	though the respondent had made comment that	
	the prayer for the mother of the applicant was	
	rejected in 2001, however she was interviewed	
	in 2002.	
	The Departmental Representative for	
	the respondents have vehemently submitted	
	that the application is not maintainable as the	
	application for compassionate appointment was	
	submitted before the authority after 16 years	
	from the date of death of the deceased employee	
	even when the applicant was minor i.e. 7(seven)	
	years 2(two) months old. It has been further	
	submitted that in the impugned order there is	
	typographical error in the year 2001 in place of	
	2002. However even the mother of the applicant	
	never approached this Tribunal challenging the	
	non-action on the part of the respondents as	
	claimed by the applicant. It has been further	
	submitted that on the earlier occasion the	
	applicant approached this Tribunal in OA-78 of	
	2018 and withdrew the application without any	
	leave. Therefore he cannot file this application	

Form No.

Vs.

NurAlam

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-978 of 2018

Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary
1	again.	3
	We have heard both the parties and	
	perused the records. It is an admitted fact that	
	the concerned employee expired on 19-03-2001	
	and the applicant had approached before the	
	authority on 06-12-2017 i.e. after more than 16	
	years. However, even if, we have to accept the	
	contention of the applicant that the earlier	
	prayer for compassionate appointment made by	
	his mother was not rejected or communicated	
	to him, in that event also it is an admitted fact	
	that the mother of the applicant never	
	approached this Tribunal challenging the non-	
	action on the part of the respondents for non-	
	considering her case within a stipulated period	
	of time. It is a settle principle of law that the	
	main purpose of granting compassionate	
	appointment is to give financial assistant to	
	overcome the financial crisis caused due to	
	sudden demise of the sole bread earner and	
	obviously immediately but, in the instant case	
	though the mother of the applicant probably	
	had approached before the authority and the	
	authority even if not communicate any decision	

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-978 of 2018

Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
	to the mother of the applicant, the mother of	
	the applicant should have approached this	
	Tribunal with her grievance. Therefore since	
	she never agitated against such non-action till	
	today. Therefore, this cannot be a valid ground	
	for quashing of the impugned order as the	
	respondents had rightly rejected the claim of	
	the applicant who was minor at the time of	
	death of ex-employee and had approached the	
	authority after more than 16 years of time	
	when the claim of the mother is still pending	
	with the authority. However as per the	
	respondents they have already rejected the	
	claim of the mother of the applicant. Therefore	
	in our considered opinion as the compassionate	
	appointment is not a hereditary right which can	
	be claimed at any point of time, the	
	respondents have rightly rejected the claim of	
	the applicant. Accordingly, the OA is dismissed	
	being devoid of merit.	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER(A) MEMBER(J)	
Mihir		

	NurAlam
Form No.	••••
	Vs.
	The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. <u>OA-978 of 20</u>	<u>018</u>	
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunalwith signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature
1		of parties when necessary
_		3