2026:CGHC:26803

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPS No. 4955 of 2026

Naveen Lahoriya S/o Late Munnalal Aged About 37 Years R/o- Balmiki Chowk, Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, C.G.

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Urban Administration and Development Department, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Commissioner Municipal Corporation, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Deputy Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Saket Pandey, Advocate
For State/Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Aditya Tiwari, PL
For Respondents No.2 & 3	:	Mr. Khilendra Sahu, Advocate appears on behalf of Mr. Shaleen Singh Baghel, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Bibhu Datta Guru)

Order on Board

01/07/2026

ASHUTOSH MISHRA
Digitally signed by ASHUTOSH MISHRA
Date: 2026.07.02 10:46:40 +0530

1. By way of the instant writ petition, the petitioner is questioning the order dated 28/06/2014 whereby the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected on the ground that the

mother of the petitioner is a government employee.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the order dated 28/06/2014 has been challenged for the first time before this Court in the present writ petition, however, in the year 2021 the petitioner has moved an application before the concerned authority stating that the petitioner was not residing with her mother and he was residing separately and was fully dependent on his father only.

3. *Per contra*, learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for the Respondent Municipal Corporation would submit that the instant petition suffers from delay and laches as the petitioner has challenged the order dated 28/06/2014 after a lapse of more than 12 years and no explanation has been given with regard to the said delay. They would further submit that the application of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment has been rejected on the ground that the mother of the petitioner was in government service at the time of death of the father of the petitioner, therefore, there is no illegality or perversity in the order passed by the authorities rejecting the claim of the petitioner.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents attached with the petition.

5. From perusal of the documents and the contentions raised by the petitioner, it appears that the application of the petitioner has already been rejected on 28/06/2014 by considering the condition enumerated in the policy which was existing at the relevant point of time. Further, the

instant petition has been filed with a delay of 12 years and no explanation has been tendered for the said delay.

6. Another aspect which cannot be brushed aside is the fact that the basic object for framing of a policy for compassionate appointment is to meet the immediate financial crises, which the family faces on the sudden death of the bread earner in the family. The object of compassionate appointment also is to tie away the financial crunch or the stage of penury which the family may face in the light of the sole earning member of the family meeting with an untimely death. Whereas in the present case, the mother of the petitioner herein, who is the wife of the deceased employee is already in government service that too the death took place in the year 2014 and the application of the petitioner has been rejected in the year 2014 itself on the same ground, but the same has not been challenged by the petitioner, however, the petitioner used to file the representations.

7. It is the trite law that simply by making repeated representations when there is no statutory provision, the period of limitation would not get extended. The law does not permit extension of period of limitation by mere filing of a representation. A person may go on making representations for years and in such an event the period of limitation would not commence from the last representation is made. In the case at hand, the petitioner lastly submitted the representation in year 2021 and thereafter he has not initiated any efforts. Therefore, mere filing the representations does not make the petitioner entitled to get the compassionate appointment.

8. Accordingly, the instant petition being devoid of merits liable to be and is hereby dismissed at the motion stage itself.

SD/-
(Bibhu Datta Guru)
JUDGE

ashu