

(2017) 02 MP CK 0074
MADHYA PRADESH HIGH COURT
Case No: 14319 of 2015

Paresh Singh Sikarwar

APPELLANT

Vs

State of M.P. & others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Feb. 7, 2017

Acts Referred:

- Constitution of India, Article 226 - Power of High Courts to Issue certain writs

Hon'ble Judges: Sujoy Paul

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ayush Choubey, Sonali Shrivastava

Final Decision: Disposed Of

Judgement

1. This writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, takes exception to the order dated 03.06.2013 (Annexure-P/8), whereby the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment is rejected on the ground that the petitioner failed to produce the relevant original documents despite directions passed by the authorities.

2. Mr. Choubey, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no doubt the petitioner received the directions to submit the original documents, but the original documents were deposited before the Bank. The respondents were apprised about this fact by communication dated 07.01.2012 (Annexure-R/3). It is submitted that now the petitioner has received the relevant documents which can be produce by him before the respondents. Accordingly, the respondents be directed to consider the claim of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment on the basis of the said documents.

3. Ms. Sonali Shrivastava, learned P.L., has no objection.

4. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of by permitting the petitioner to file a fresh representation and produce the relevant documents before the respondent No.7, alongwith copy of this order.
5. In turn, the respondent No.7 shall examine the claim of the petitioner on the basis of the documents produced by him. The respondent No.7 shall examine the petitioner's claim afresh without getting influenced by his earlier order dated 03.06.2013. The entire exercise be completed within 60 days for the date of submission of the representation. The outcome shall be communicated to the petitioner.
6. Petition stand disposed of without expressing any view on the merits of the case.