



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3506]

**TUESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

WRIT PETITION NO: 3115/2023

Between:

Veeravalilaxmi

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.KALLA TULASI
DURGAMBA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.N B CHANDRA SEKHAR SC FOR YSR HORTICULTURE
UNIVERSITY
2.GP FOR AGRICULTURE

The Court made the following ORDER:

This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of
India seeking following prayer:

“to declare the inaction of the respondent in considering the
petitioners application dated 17.10.2020 for appointment of
the petitioner under compassionate ground as illegal,

arbitrary and unconstitutional and against settled principles of law and consequently direct the respondents to consider the petitioners application dated 17.10.2020 for appointment of the petitioner under compassionate ground and to pass such other orders.”

2. Heard Smt.Kalla Tulasidurgamba, learned counsel for petitioner, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Agriculture for the 1st respondent and Sri N.B.Chandra Sekhar, learned standing counsel, for the respondents 2 to 4.

3. Petitioner's father, while discharging duties with 3rd respondent and 4th respondent, as Agricultural Workmen, died in harness on 08.12.2019. Petitioner submitted application dated 17.10.2020 through proper channel to 3rd respondent enclosing various documents claiming for compassionate appointment. Petitioner though was married, her husband deserted her, therefore, she has been living with parents and is completely dependant on her father. Petitioner has submitted family member certificate issued by Tahsildar, no earning member certificate, no property certificate, dated 21.05.2020, also issued by the office of Tahsildar, besides various documents as set out along with application dated 17.10.2020. The 4th respondent by letter dated 19.10.2020 called upon petitioner to

submit further documents in terms of Memo dated 20.03.2004 issued by Government, petitioner stated to have submitted all the documents and has been awaiting for consideration of her application. However, as respondents did not pass any orders, she preferred present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that when along with application dated 17.10.2020 all required documents are submitted and after 4th respondent calling upon to submit some more documents in terms of Memo dated 20.03.2004, which also came to be furnished, the 3rd respondent instead of considering the case of petitioner for compassionate appointment, has not acted upon. Petitioner though is married woman, since she has been deserted by her husband, she completely being dependent on her late father, she is entitled to claim compassionate appointment and even otherwise also, the Division Bench of this Court in **Commissioner of Police v. K.Padmaja**¹ held that even married daughter of deceased employee is entitled for compassionate appointment if she does not have any definite income and was dependent on deceased father. As petitioner completely dependent on her father and the documents submitted

¹ 2013 (4) ALT 501

in support of her claim are not considered, prayer is made to direct to the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders on the application of the petitioner.

5. Sri N.B.Chandra Sekhar, learned standing counsel for respondents, by referring to the contents of counter reiterated the stand that petitioner has not submitted necessary documents as sought for by respondents in terms of Memo dated 20.03.2004, unless those documents are furnished and that petitioner establishes she is living with her father and has no means of income, her case cannot be considered for compassionate appointment.

6. Considered rival submissions and this Court is of the view that though petitioner has submitted application dated 17.10.2020 enclosing various documents in support of her case, the 4th respondent has called upon the petitioner to submit further documents, which petitioner in turn stated to have submitted, the respondents ought to have decided the matter on merits. The contention of respondents that petitioner though was called upon to submit certain documents in terms of Memo dated 20.03.2004, the letter dated 19.10.2022 addressed by 4th respondent to the petitioner is so vague as it does not mention as to what

documents exactly are required to be submitted by the petitioner, whereas the petitioner's application clearly sets out various documents already furnished.

7. In this view of the matter, the 3rd respondent is permitted to call upon the petitioner to submit any specific documents if feel relevant for the purpose of examining and considering claim of petitioner for compassionate appointment in terms of her application dated 17.10.2020, in which case, the 3rd respondent is directed to address such letter calling for any further document within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and petitioner to submit the relevant documents within a further period of two weeks thereafter and on receiving the same, the application of petitioner shall be considered and decided in accordance with law within a period of four weeks.

8. With the above observation, this writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending consideration, if any, in this case shall stand closed.

CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J

08.04.2025

SS