CGHC010050192020 2026:CGHC:38644

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 920 of 2020

Anubhav Nage S/o Late Bhuvneshwar Nage Aged About 25 Years R/o R. E. S. Colony, Shantinagar, Sukma, Tahsil And District Sukma Chhattisgarh, District : Sukuma, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

Versus

SAIFAN KHAN Digitally signed by SAIFAN KHAN

1 - State Government Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - The Collector Sukma, District Sukma Chhattisgarh, District : Sukuma, Chhattisgarh

3 - Additional Collector Sukma, District Sukma Chhattisgarh, District : Sukuma, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

[Cause-title taken from Case Information System (CIS)]

For Petitioner : Mr. Somkant Verma, Advocate

For Respondents : Mr. Sharad Mishra, Panel Lawyer

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

(Order on Board)

01.09.2026

1. Heard.

2. In this petition, the petitioner has challenged order dated 28.01.2020, passed by the respondent No.03, whereby his claim for compassionate appointment has been rejected.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submit that the order impugned is bad, illegal and unsustainable in law and, therefore, the same is liable to be set aside.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel submits that since the mother of the petitioner is already in government service and posted as Head Mistress in the Government Middle School, Murtonda, District Sukma (CG), therefore, the claim of the petitioner has rightly been rejected in light of para-6 of the circular dated 29.08.2016. Thus, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

5. In the present case, since mother of the petitioner is already in government service and posted as Head Mistress in the Government Middle School, Murtonda, District Sukma (CG), therefore, the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has rightly been rejected by the respondents in light of para-6 of the circular dated 29.08.2016 (amending earlier circular dated 14.06.2013). Accordingly, I do not find any merit in this petition. It deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**.

sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

s@if