



2026:CGHC:22157-DB
NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 429 of 2026

Commissioner Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur, District- Sarguja
(C.G.)

... Appellant

versus

1 - Mukund Hela S/o Late Shri Kailash Ram R/o Bhatthapara, Ward No. 45, Ambikapur, District- Sarguja, C.G.

2 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Urban Administration And Development Department, Naya Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Director Directorate of Urban Administration And Development, Naya Raipur, District - Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	: Mr. Bhupendra Singh, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	: Mr. Anukul Biswas, Advocate
For Respondents No.2 & 3/State	: Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

12.05.2026

1. Heard Mr. Bhupendra Singh, learned counsel for the appellant. Also heard Mr. Anukul Biswas, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 as well as Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General, appearing for the State/respondents No.2 and 3.

2. By way of this writ appeal, appellant has prayed for following relief(s):-

“1. That, this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to call for the records of wps no. 9376 of 2023 from the file of the hon'ble single bench;

2. That, this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to set aside and quash the impugned order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Single Bench in WPS No. 9376 of 2023 (Mukund Hela vs. State of Chhattisgarh & Ors.) and uphold/affirm the order dated 30.05.2018 passed by the Appellant, as being in strict consonance with the mandatory State Policy dated 14.06.2013;

3. That, this Hon'ble court may kindly be pleased to grant any other relief as deemed fit by this Hon'ble Court.”

3. The present intra Court appeal has been filed against the order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.9376/2023 (*Mukund Hela v. State of Chhattisgarh and others*) whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant/writ petitioner before the learned Single Judge has been allowed.
4. Brief facts of the case before the learned Single Judge, in nutshell, are that the father of the writ petitioner, late Kailash Ram, was working on the post of Sanitary Worker under the Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur. During the course of his service, he died

in harness on 03.09.2017 leaving behind his wife, three sons and one daughter, all of whom were dependent upon the income of the deceased employee. After the untimely death of his father, the writ petitioner submitted an application dated 27.11.2017 seeking compassionate appointment in accordance with the applicable policy of the State Government.

- 5.** It was the case of the writ petitioner before the learned Single Judge that his application for compassionate appointment came to be rejected on the ground that his mother was employed as a Safai Karmachari and, therefore, the family was not entitled to compassionate appointment. Thereafter, the writ petitioner submitted a representation/appeal before the Director stating that although his mother was in service, she was due to retire in the year 2028 and after her retirement the family would be left without adequate financial support. Taking note of the said grievance, the Director vide communication dated 17.07.2018 forwarded the matter to the Commissioner for reconsideration of the claim of the writ petitioner.
- 6.** The writ petitioner further pleaded before the learned Single Judge that thereafter he again submitted an application dated 27.06.2018 seeking compassionate appointment and specifically referred to similarly situated persons namely Surendra Bahadur Singh and Suraj Kirwar, who were allegedly granted compassionate appointment despite the fact that their mothers

were employed in Government service. According to the writ petitioner, denial of compassionate appointment to him while extending similar benefit to other similarly situated persons amounted to arbitrary and discriminatory treatment.

7. It was further contended by the writ petitioner that despite repeated representations and communications issued by the competent authorities for reconsideration of his claim, the respondents failed to take any final decision in accordance with the compassionate appointment policy applicable in the State.
8. According to the writ petitioner, such inaction on the part of the respondent authorities was unjustified, arbitrary and contrary to the object underlying compassionate appointment, namely to provide immediate financial assistance to the family of a deceased employee dying in harness.
9. Feeling aggrieved by non-consideration of his claim, the writ petitioner preferred the writ petition before the learned Single Judge bearing WPS No.9376/2023, which was allowed by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 28.02.2026
10. Challenging the aforesaid order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.9376/2023, the present writ appeal has been preferred by the appellant—Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur, who was arrayed as respondent No.3 before the learned Single Judge.

- 11.** Learned counsel appearing for the appellant–Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur would submit that the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge is wholly illegal, contrary to the governing policy dated 14.06.2013 and unsustainable in law. It is contended that the learned Single Judge failed to appreciate that the Policy of 2013 is a complete code in itself and Clause 6 thereof specifically provides that where any member of the family of the deceased employee is already in Government service, the dependent claimant becomes ineligible for compassionate appointment. According to learned counsel, the writ Court, while directing reconsideration/grant of compassionate appointment ignoring the employment of the writ petitioner’s mother, has virtually rewritten the policy and rendered the mandatory disqualification clause otiose.
- 12.** It is further submitted that under the earlier policy/guidelines of the year 2003 there existed a discretionary provision enabling consideration of cases where the income of the earning member was insufficient for sustenance of the family, however, the said provision was consciously omitted in the Policy dated 14.06.2013 with a clear legislative intent to strictly regulate compassionate appointments and prohibit relaxation once a family member is already in Government employment. Learned counsel would submit that the writ petitioner had never challenged the validity of the policy itself and had only assailed the rejection order dated 30.05.2018 and, therefore, in absence of challenge to the policy,

no direction contrary to the express terms thereof could have been issued by the learned Single Judge.

- 13.** Learned counsel for the appellant would further submit that the learned Single Judge has committed grave error in extending relief on the basis of parity by relying upon alleged instances of appointments granted to similarly situated persons. It is contended that the appellant–Corporation had specifically filed verification and affidavit dated 24.02.2026 clarifying that the persons named by the writ petitioner were never appointed by the Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur and, therefore, the very foundation of parity pleaded by the writ petitioner was factually incorrect.
- 14.** It is argued that compassionate appointment is not a regular source of recruitment but merely an exception carved out to mitigate immediate financial distress caused due to death of the sole breadwinner and since the writ petitioner’s mother is admittedly a regularized Safai Karmachari employed under the Municipal Corporation, the family cannot be said to be suffering from immediate penury or financial destitution warranting invocation of the exceptional scheme. Learned counsel submits that the writ petition itself suffered from gross delay and laches inasmuch as the rejection order dated 30.05.2018 was challenged only in the year 2023 after lapse of more than five years and such delay itself demolishes the claim of immediate financial hardship, which forms the very basis of compassionate appointment.

15. It is further contended that the learned Single Judge erred in placing reliance upon decisions rendered in the context of the earlier 2003 policy and failed to appreciate that after issuance of the restrictive Policy dated 14.06.2013, the legal position stands materially altered.
16. Learned counsel would submit that the impugned order is also contrary to the binding precedents rendered by the Division Bench and Full Bench of this Court in ***State of Chhattisgarh and others vs. Purendra Kumar Sinha and W.A. No.236/2022 (State of Chhattisgarh and others vs. Umesh Thakur)***, wherein it has been categorically held that once one family member of the deceased employee is already in Government service and the applicable policy bars compassionate appointment in such circumstances, the writ Court cannot direct enquiry regarding dependency or financial insufficiency as the same would amount to rewriting the policy. Reliance has also been placed upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***N.C. Santhosh vs. State of Karnataka and others, (2020) 7 SCC 617*** and ***State of Himachal Pradesh vs. Shashi Kumar, (2019) 3 SCC 653*** to contend that compassionate appointment must strictly conform to the governing policy and sympathy cannot override the mandate of law.
17. On the strength of the aforesaid submissions, it is prayed that the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge be set aside and the writ appeal be allowed.

- 18.** On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1/writ petitioner supported the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge and submitted that the same has been passed after due consideration of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and does not warrant interference in the present writ appeal. It is contended that though the mother of the writ petitioner was employed as a Safai Karmachari under the Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur, her income was extremely meagre and insufficient to maintain the entire family after the death of the sole breadwinner and, therefore, the object underlying compassionate appointment, namely to provide immediate financial assistance to the bereaved family, squarely stood attracted in the present case. Learned counsel submits that the learned Single Judge has rightly taken into consideration the fact that under the earlier policy prevailing prior to the Policy dated 14.06.2013, provision existed enabling consideration of cases where the income of the earning family member was inadequate for sustenance of the family and merely because such clause was omitted subsequently, the authorities could not have adopted a hyper-technical approach defeating the beneficial object of compassionate appointment.
- 19.** Learned counsel for respondent No.1 further submits that the rejection order dated 30.05.2018 was passed mechanically without examining the actual financial condition of the family and without considering the fact that the writ petitioner was wholly

dependent upon the deceased employee. It is argued that similarly situated persons had been granted compassionate appointment by different Municipal Corporations despite one family member being in employment and, therefore, denial of similar consideration to the writ petitioner amounts to hostile discrimination and arbitrary exercise of power violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It is also submitted that compassionate appointment schemes being beneficial in nature deserve liberal interpretation so as to advance the cause of social justice rather than frustrate legitimate claims on technical grounds. Learned counsel would further contend that the learned Single Judge has merely directed reconsideration of the case of the writ petitioner and has not straightway directed appointment and, therefore, no prejudice whatsoever is caused to the appellants. On the basis of the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel prays for dismissal of the writ appeal.

- 20.** Learned State counsel supported the impugned order and submitted that the learned Single Judge has rightly directed reconsideration of the case of the writ petitioner in accordance with law. It is submitted that no positive direction for compassionate appointment has been issued and, therefore, no interference is called for in the present writ appeal.
- 21.** We have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties at length and carefully considered their rival submissions as also the impugned order dated 28.02.2026 passed in WPS No.9376/2023.

22. After appreciating the submissions of learned counsel for the parties therein as also the materials on record, the learned Single Judge while relying upon the judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of U.P. v. Premlata, (2022) 1 SCC 30**, has passed the impugned order in following terms:-

“7. Upon consideration of the submissions and facts of the case, it is apparent that the petitioner’s family lost its primary source of livelihood due to the untimely demise of his father. Compassionate appointments are intended to provide immediate relief to such families in distress. The circumstances of the petitioner are compelling, and a mechanical application of the rule regarding the mother’s employment would result in undue hardship and defeat the very purpose of compassionate appointment. It is, therefore, held that the ground of the petitioner’s mother being employed as a Safai Karmachari is not required to be considered for the purpose of granting compassionate appointment in this case.

8. The objective of compassionate appointment is to provide financial support to the family of the deceased employee, and this objective would be defeated if the petitioner is denied relief on such a technical ground. The employment of the petitioner’s mother, or the post he seeks, does not warrant consideration in light of the broader purpose of providing relief to the bereaved

family.

9. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of State of U.P. v. Premlata, reported in (2022) 1 SCC 30 has reiterated that compassionate appointment is meant to relieve the family from financial hardship, and the competent authority must examine the financial status and dependency of family members before deciding the claim. It was held as under :

“8. While considering the issue involved in the present appeal, the law laid down by this Court on compassionate ground on the death of the deceased employee are required to be referred to and considered. In the recent decision, this Court in State of Karnataka v. V. Somyashree [State of Karnataka v. V. Somyashree, (2021) 12 SCC 20 : 2021 SCC OnLine SC 704] , had occasion to consider the principle governing the grant of appointment on compassionate ground. After referring to the decision of this Court in N.C. Santhosh v. State of Karnataka [N.C. Santhosh v. State of Karnataka, (2020) 7 SCC 617 : (2020) 2 SCC (L&S) 861] , this Court has summarised the principle governing the grant of appointment on compassionate ground as under : (V. Somyashree case [State of Karnataka v. V. Somyashree, (2021) 12 SCC 20 : 2021 SCC OnLine SC 704] , SCC para 10)

“10.1. That the compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule.

10.2. That no aspirant has a right to compassionate appointment.

10.3. The appointment to any public post in the service of the State has to be made

on the basis of the principle in accordance with Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

10.4. Appointment on compassionate ground can be made only on fulfilling the norms laid down by the State's policy and/or satisfaction of the eligibility criteria as per the policy.

10.5. The norms prevailing on the date of the consideration of the application should be the basis for consideration of claim for compassionate appointment.”

9. As per the law laid down by this Court in a catena of decisions on the appointment on compassionate ground, for all the government vacancies equal opportunity should be provided to all aspirants as mandated under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. However, appointment on compassionate ground offered to a dependant of a deceased employee is an exception to the said norms. The compassionate ground is a concession and not a right.

9.1. In State of H.P. v. Shashi Kumar [State of H.P. v. Shashi Kumar, (2019) 3 SCC 653 : (2019) 1 SCC (L&S) 542] , this Court in paras 21 and 26 had an occasion to consider the object and purpose of appointment on compassionate ground and considered decision of this Court in Govind Prakash Verma v. LIC [Govind Prakash Verma v. LIC, (2005) 10 SCC 289 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 590] , it is observed and held as under : (Shashi Kumar case [State of H.P. v. Shashi Kumar, (2019) 3 SCC 653 : (2019) 1 SCC2026:CGHC:10602 (L&S) 542] , SCC pp. 665-68, paras 21 & 26)

“21. The decision in Govind Prakash Verma [Govind Prakash Verma v. LIC, (2005) 10 SCC 289 : 2005 SCC (L&S)

590] , has been considered subsequently in several decisions. But, before we advert to those decisions, it is necessary to note that the nature of compassionate appointment had been considered by this Court in Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana [Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 138 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 930] . The principles which have been laid down in Umesh Kumar Nagpal [Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 138 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 930] have been subsequently followed in a consistent line of precedents in this Court. These principles are encapsulated in the following extract : (Umesh Kumar Nagpal case [Umesh Kumar Nagpal v. State of Haryana, (1994) 4 SCC 138 : 1994 SCC (L&S) 930] , SCC pp. 139-40, para 2)

'2. ... As a rule, appointments in the public services should be made strictly on the basis of open invitation of applications and merit. No other mode of appointment nor any other consideration is permissible. Neither the Governments nor the public authorities are at liberty to follow any other procedure or relax the qualifications laid down by the rules for the post. However, to this general rule which is to be followed strictly in every case, there are some exceptions carved out in the interests of justice and to meet certain contingencies. One such exception is in favour of the dependants of an employee dying-in-harness and leaving his family in penury and without any means of livelihood. In such cases, out of pure humanitarian consideration taking into consideration the fact that unless some source of livelihood is provided, the family would not be able to make both ends meet, a provision is made in the rules to provide gainful employment

to one of the dependants of the deceased who may be eligible for such employment. The whole object of granting compassionate employment is thus to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis. The object is not to give a member of such family a post much less a post for post held by the deceased. What is further, mere death of an employee in harness does not entitle his family to such source of livelihood. The Government or the public authority concerned has to examine the financial condition of the family of the deceased, and it is only if it is satisfied, that but for the provision of employment, the family will not be able to meet the crisis that a job is to be offered to the eligible member of the family. The posts in Classes III and IV are the lowest posts in non-manual and manual categories and hence they alone can be offered on compassionate grounds, the object being to relieve the family, of the financial destitution and to help it get over the emergency. The provision of employment in such lowest posts by making an exception to the rule is justifiable and valid since it is not discriminatory. The favourable treatment given to such dependant of the deceased employee in such posts has a rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved viz. Relief against destitution. No other posts are expected or required to be given by the public authorities for the purpose. It must be remembered in this connection that as against the destitute family of the deceased there are millions of other families which are equally, if not more destitute. The exception to the rule made in favour of the family of the deceased employee is in consideration of the services rendered by him and the

legitimate expectations, and the change in the status and affairs, of the family engendered by the erstwhile employment which are suddenly upturned.'

26. *The judgment of a Bench of two Judges in Mumtaz Yunus Mulani v. State of Maharashtra [Mumtaz Yunus Mulani v. State of Maharashtra, (2008) 11 SCC 384 : (2008) 2 SCC (L&S) 1077] has adopted the principle that appointment on compassionate grounds is not a source of recruitment, but a means to enable the family of the deceased to get over a sudden financial crisis. The financial position of the family would need to be evaluated on the basis of the provisions contained in the scheme. The decision in Govind Prakash Verma [Govind Prakash Verma v. LIC, (2005) 10 SCC 289 : 2005 SCC (L&S) 590] has been duly considered, but the Court observed that it did not appear that the earlier binding precedents of this Court have been taken note of in that case."*

10. *Thus, as per the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions, compassionate appointment is an exception to the general rule of appointment in the public services and is in favour of the dependants of a deceased dying-in-harness and leaving his family in penury and without any means of livelihood, and in such cases, out of pure humanitarian consideration taking into consideration the fact that unless some source of livelihood is provided, the family would not be able to make both ends meet, a provision is made in the rules to provide gainful employment to one of the dependants of the deceased who may be eligible for such employment. The whole*

object of granting compassionate employment is thus to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis. The object is not to give such family a post much less a post held by the deceased.”

10. Thus, it is evident from the above that while considering the claim for compassionate appointment, the competent authority is required to examine whether the family is still in financial distress.

11. It would be apt to mention that the respondent – Corporation has given compassionate appointment to the person, the case of which are identical to the petitioners. In the case of similar placed person, their mothers are employed in government service on account of death of father, they were granted compassionate appointment, as such, the petitioner cannot be denied compassionate appointment.

12. It has also been brought to the attention of this Court that two other individuals, namely Surendra Bahadur Singh and Suraj Kirwar, were granted compassionate appointments by the respondent–Corporation despite the fact that their mothers were already employed in Government service. It is submitted that the cases of the aforesaid individuals are identical to that of the present petitioner, inasmuch as their fathers had died and their mothers were in Government employment, yet compassionate appointment was extended to them. In such

circumstances, when similarly situated persons have been granted the benefit of compassionate appointment, denial of the same to the petitioner would be arbitrary and discriminatory. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be deprived of compassionate appointment when the respondent—Corporation has extended the said benefit to other similarly placed persons.

13. In view of the above facts and in the light of decision of Hon 'ble Supreme Court, the order dated 30.05.2018 passed by respondent No. 3 rejecting the petitioner's application for compassionate appointment (Annexure P-1) is quashed. Respondent No. 3 is hereby directed to grant compassionate appointment to the petitioner at the earliest possible date, following due procedure and formalities, but without raising any objection on account of the mother's employment.

14. The writ petition is, accordingly, allowed.

No order as to costs."

- 23.** From perusal of the record, it transpires that the father of the writ petitioner died in harness while serving as a Sanitary Worker under the Municipal Corporation, Ambikapur and, after his death, the writ petitioner had submitted an application seeking compassionate appointment in order to support the bereaved family. It is also borne out from the record that the claim of the writ petitioner came to be rejected solely on the ground that his

mother was serving as a Safai Karmachari under the Municipal Corporation. The learned Single Judge, while examining the legality and propriety of the rejection order dated 30.05.2018, has taken into consideration the object and purpose underlying the scheme of compassionate appointment as also the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of *Premlata* (supra) and other binding precedents governing the field.

- 24.** It is well settled that compassionate appointment is not a vested right nor an alternative mode of recruitment, however, at the same time, the scheme has been framed with a humanitarian object to provide immediate succour to the family of a deceased employee who dies in harness leaving his dependents in financial distress. The authorities, while considering such claim, are required to adopt a pragmatic and purposive approach keeping in view the financial condition of the family and the surrounding circumstances instead of rejecting the claim on mere technicalities.
- 25.** The learned Single Judge, after considering the peculiar facts of the present case, has recorded a finding that the family of the writ petitioner had lost its principal breadwinner and mere employment of the mother as a Safai Karmachari by itself could not have been treated as an absolute circumstance to non-suit the writ petitioner without examining the actual financial condition and dependency of the family members.

- 26.** It further appears from the record that the writ petitioner had specifically brought to the notice of the authorities that similarly situated persons, namely Surendra Bahadur Singh and Suraj Kirwar, had been extended the benefit of compassionate appointment despite the fact that their mothers were also in Government service. The learned Single Judge has taken note of the said aspect while considering the plea of discriminatory treatment. Though the appellant–Corporation attempted to dispute the said factual assertion, however, no material of such nature has been brought on record before this Court so as to conclusively demonstrate that the findings recorded by the learned Single Judge are perverse or wholly unsupported by the record.
- 27.** This Court is also of the considered opinion that the learned Single Judge has not directed automatic or unconditional appointment de hors the governing policy, but has examined the matter in the backdrop of the beneficial object of compassionate appointment and the peculiar facts obtaining in the present case. The impugned order reflects that the learned Single Judge was conscious of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that compassionate appointment is intended to mitigate financial hardship faced by the family of the deceased employee.
- 28.** The observations made by the learned Single Judge are essentially founded upon the requirement of examining the real

financial distress of the family rather than mechanically applying the exclusion clause without regard to the ground realities of the case.

- 29.** So far as the contention of the appellant regarding the applicability of the Policy dated 14.06.2013 and the judgments rendered in ***Purendra Kumar Sinha*** and ***Umesh Thakur*** (supra) is concerned, there can be no quarrel with the proposition that compassionate appointment must ordinarily be governed by the prevailing policy and the Court cannot rewrite the terms of the scheme. However, at the same time, every case has to be examined on its own facts and the writ Court, in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is not denuded of the power to interfere where the decision-making process suffers from arbitrariness, non-consideration of relevant factors or mechanical exercise of discretion. In the present case, the learned Single Judge has found that the authorities rejected the claim of the writ petitioner without proper consideration of the actual financial hardship suffered by the family and without adverting to the surrounding circumstances brought on record by the writ petitioner.
- 30.** This Court also finds substance in the reasoning assigned by the learned Single Judge that the object of compassionate appointment would stand frustrated if the claim of the writ petitioner is rejected solely on account of the employment of his

mother, despite the fact that the family had lost its earning member and continued to face financial hardship. Merely because one member of the family is engaged on a low-paid post would not, in every case, conclusively establish that the family has ceased to suffer financial distress. The scheme of compassionate appointment, being a welfare measure, requires a meaningful and contextual consideration of the claim.

- 31.** Insofar as the objection regarding delay and laches is concerned, this Court finds that the record reveals continuous representations and pursuit of the claim by the writ petitioner before the competent authorities. The communications issued by the authorities for reconsideration of the matter also indicate that the grievance of the writ petitioner remained under active consideration and, therefore, it cannot be said that the writ petitioner had abandoned his claim altogether. In such circumstances, the learned Single Judge cannot be said to have committed any jurisdictional error in entertaining the writ petition.
- 32.** Having bestowed our anxious consideration to the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, the material available on record and the reasons assigned by the learned Single Judge, we are of the considered view that the impugned order dated 28.02.2026 does not suffer from any patent illegality, perversity or jurisdictional infirmity warranting interference in the present intra-Court appeal. The learned Single

Judge has exercised the writ jurisdiction keeping in view the humanitarian object underlying compassionate appointment and has passed a well-reasoned order after due consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case.

- 33.** Accordingly, the writ appeal being devoid of merits deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**. Consequently, the order dated 28.02.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.9376/2023 is affirmed.
- 34.** There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice