



Serial No.27
Regular List

HIGH COURT OF MEGHALAYA
AT SHILLONG

WP(C). No. 422 of 2026

Date of Decision: 05.10.2026

Uploaded on: 05.10.2026

Shri. Bolin Patra,
S/o (L) Kuledhar Patra
R/o Laban, Shillong,
East Khasi Hills District,
Meghalaya.

...Petitioner

-Versus-

1. Union of India, represented by Principal,
Secretary Ministry of Home Affairs
Youth of India at New Delhi.
2. The Surveyor General of India
Dehra Dun Survey of India-248001
(through the Director A + Na GDC Guwahati)
Surveyor.
3. Survey of India Khalasi Assam & Nagaland
G.D.C Shillong Wing.

...Respondents

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice H.S.Thangkhiew, Judge

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/Applicant(s) : Ms. S.Rahman, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : None



- | | | |
|-----|---|--------|
| i) | Whether approved for reporting in Law Journals etc: | Yes/No |
| ii) | Whether approved for publication in press: | Yes/No |
-

JUDGMENT (ORAL):

1. Heard Ms. S.Rahman, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The case of the petitioner is that he is the son of one (L) Kuledhar Patra, who was working as an Assistant in the Survey of India, Shillong, and who expired on 16-04-2014.
3. The petitioner, it is submitted had on 13-10-2014 applied for consideration for appointment on compassionate ground, but the same was rejected on 08-06-2016 by the respondents. The only prayer made in the instant writ petition is that some consideration be given to consider the case of the writ petitioner.
4. Though none appears on behalf of the respondents, this Court, on examining the materials that have been placed, firstly notes that the challenge to the rejection dated 08-06-2016, is being made at this late stage i.e. after over 10 years. Further, a study of the documents would show that as far back as on 24-05-2016, in the parameters of the applicants who were considered for consideration, the case of the petitioner was found not to come within the zone of consideration. On this ground, the said prayer for compassionate appointment was rejected.



5. This Court notes that compassionate appointment is afforded or considered to the immediate family members of a deceased employee who dies in harness to tide over immediate financial difficulties so as not to render them destitute. In the instant case, the case of the petitioner was considered in 2016 and was rejected by the respondents. Apart from the delay in approaching this Court, the fact that the petitioner was not eligible at the time of consideration, in the considered view of this Court, the instant case has no merits and is accordingly dismissed.

Judge

