



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5322/2017
CNR: RJHC010810982017 | URN: CW / 12314U / 2017

Shivprakash S/o Late Shri Jagram Bishnoi, Resident Of Vpo
Bolanwali, Tehsil Sangaria District Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan Through Director General Of
Police Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Inspector General Of Police Bikaner Range, Bikaner.
3. Superintendent Of Police, Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Siddharth Jhajharia for Mr. R.S. Choudhary
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Prem Singh Bhati for Subhash Choudhary, AGC

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BIPIN GUPTA

Order

12/10/2026

1. The present writ petition has been filed assailing the action
of the respondents in denying compassionate appointment to the
petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the
deceased, namely, Jag Ram, was an employee of the respondent
Department and expired on 26.06.1997.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner
was adopted by the deceased, Jag Ram, and his wife, Bhagwanti,
on 15.03.1996.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the deed of
adoption was registered on 31.05.2002.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore, submits that the respondents have illegally denied compassionate appointment to the petitioner.

6. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner was never shown as a family member of the deceased employee. He further submits that the wife of the deceased had furnished an affidavit stating therein that the petitioner had not been adopted during the lifetime of the deceased but had been adopted only after his death.

7. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that, if the petitioner's contention that he was adopted in 1996 were correct, the name of his father in the Secondary School Examination Certificate of 2002 would have been recorded as Jag Ram and not Richh Pal. However, the certificate records the name of the petitioner's father as Richh Pal and not Jag Ram. He, therefore, contends that the petitioner's claim of having been adopted during the lifetime of the deceased is incorrect. This contention is further supported by the affidavit furnished by the deceased's wife. Therefore, he submits that the petitioner is not entitled to compassionate appointment.

8. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that compassionate appointment is not an alternative mode of recruitment but a special provision for providing employment to an eligible family member of an employee who dies in harness, with a view to mitigating the financial hardship caused to the family by the employee's death. He, therefore, submits that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

9. Heard and perused the material available on record.





10. This Court finds that, in the Secondary School Examination Certificate of 2002, the name of the petitioner's father is recorded as Richh Pal and not Jag Ram. This circumstance does not support the petitioner's contention that he was adopted in 1996. Further, as is evident from the affidavit furnished by Bhagwanti, the wife of the deceased, the petitioner was not adopted during the lifetime of the deceased, Jag Ram, but was adopted only in 2002, after his death. Thus, the material on record does not establish that the petitioner was adopted during the lifetime of the deceased employee. An adoption made after the death of the employee does not, by itself, confer any right to claim compassionate appointment on the basis of such adoption. Therefore, this Court finds no illegality in the action of the respondents in denying compassionate appointment to the petitioner. The present writ petition is, therefore, dismissed.

11. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(BIPIN GUPTA),J

44/Abdul Raoof Khan