

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE RE-CONSTITUTED SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR COMPASSIONATE
APPOINTMENT FOR RECRUITMENT YEARS 2022 & 2023**

The second meeting of the Re-constituted Committee, was held in the chamber of the Chairman at Room [REDACTED] Aayakar Bhawan Annex, Kolkata- 700069 on **11.11.2025** at 03.30 P.M. under the chairmanship of [REDACTED]. The following members were present in the said meeting:

Sl No	Name	Present Post held	Designation in Re-constituted Committee
01	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Member
02	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Member
03	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Member
04	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Member
05	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Member
06	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Presenting Member

2. At the outset, the Re-constituted Committee noted that the recommendations by the re-constituted Committee vide minutes dated 26.08.2025 was put up before the Ld. Pr. CCIT, West Bengal & Sikkim. During discussion in this regard, Ld. Pr. CCIT, West Bengal & Sikkim observed that during the previous cycle of Compassionate Appointments for the RY 2017-18, 2018, 2019, 2020 & 2021; three cases were recommended by the Selection Committee, where the candidates didn't have the minimum educational qualification i.e. Matriculation or equivalent, which were referred to the Board for necessary approval by the Hon'ble Revenue Secretary as under:

- A) [REDACTED] (UR No 01/2017-18), S/o [REDACTED]
- B) [REDACTED] (UR No 05/1995-96), [REDACTED]
- C) [REDACTED] (UR No 16/1999-2000), [REDACTED]

3. The Board vide letters F No A-12012/12/2023-Ad.VII dated 11.07.2023, F No A-12012/09/2023-Ad.VII dated 03.06.2023 & F No A-12012/06/2023-Ad.VII dated 25.08.2023 had rejected the cases for appointment and intimated the following:

A) [REDACTED] (UR No 01/2017-18):

a) It is stated that the proposal for appointment of the applicant as MTS on compassionate grounds in relaxation of 'minimum educational qualification' clause has been examined by the Board in light of the rules/guidelines prescribed by DoP&T and also important Supreme Court's judgements on the subject.

b) In this connection, it is mentioned that the applicant [REDACTED] has studied [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] and since then he has not been able to acquire minimum basic qualification [REDACTED] even after a lapse of nearly 13 years since then and 05 years since he applied for compassionate appointment of [REDACTED] after death of the Government servant. It is, therefore, unlikely that applicant could acquire minimum prescribed qualification of X pass, if he is appointed as 'MTS Trainee' on compassionate grounds. Moreover, it may also be mentioned that basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, it has been noted that the family has been able to sustain and manage their house hold expenses for more than 06 years after the death of Government Servant in 2017 with the available financial resources.

c) Also, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11/12/2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee". The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence.

d) On the basis of facts/information of the case provided by the O/o Pr CCIT WB & Sikkim and after consideration of the proposal as per extant/applicable DoP&T's guidelines and various judgements of Hon'ble Supreme Court on the subject of compassionate appointment, it is found that the **instant proposal does not have any merit and cannot be acceded to.**

B) [REDACTED] (UR No 05/1995-96) :

a) It is stated that the proposal for engagement/appointment of [REDACTED] as 'MTS Trainee' on compassionate grounds has been examined by the Board in light of the rules/guidelines prescribed by DoP&T and also important Supreme Court's judgements in the matter of compassionate appointment.

b) The Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgements in this regard are mentioned as under:

(i) The Supreme Court in its judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192] has held that appointment on grounds of descent clearly violates Article 16(2) of the Constitution; but if the appointment is confined to the son or daughter or widow of the Government Servant who died in harness and who needs immediate appointment on grounds of immediate need of assistance in the event of there being no other earning member in the family to supplement the loss of income from the bread winner to relieve the economic distress of the members of the family, it is unexceptionable.

(ii) The Supreme Court's judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Nagpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] has laid down the following important principles in this regard:

->> Only dependents of an employee dying in harness leaving his family in penury and without any means of livelihood can be appointed on compassionate ground.

->> The whole object of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis and to relieve the family of the deceased from financial destitution and to help it get over the emergency.

->> Offering compassionate appointment as a matter of course irrespective of the financial condition of the family of the deceased or medically retired Government servant is legally impermissible.

(iii) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu has observed that "an appointment made many years after the death of the employee or without due consideration of the financial resources available to his/her dependents and the financial deprivation caused to the dependents as a result of his death, simply because the claimant happened to be one of the dependents of the deceased employee would be directly in conflict with Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution and hence, quite bad and illegal. In dealing with cases of compassionate appointment, it is imperative to keep this vital aspect in mind".

c) In the instant case, it has been noted that the applicant [REDACTED] passed [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] and since then he has not been able to acquire minimum basic qualification of Class Xth Pass even after a lapse of nearly 37 years. It is, therefore, felt that applicant (who is now [REDACTED] of age) is unlikely to acquire minimum prescribed qualification, if he is appointed as 'MTS Trainee' on compassionate grounds. Moreover, it may also be mentioned that basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, it has been noted that the family has been able to sustain and manage their house hold expenses for more than 27 years after the death of Government Servant [REDACTED] with the available financial resources. Attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines which states that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence". Also, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11/12/2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is

to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee". It can, therefore, be concluded that family is not reeling under any economic distress. Since, as the family has been able to manage for all these years is adequate proof that the family has a dependable means of subsistence.

d) Keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's aforesaid judgments and the facts provided by the O/o Pr CCIT WB & Sikkim, the **instant case does not deserve merit and hence could not be acceded to.**

C) [REDACTED] (UR No 16/1999-2000):

a) It is stated that the proposal for seeking approval of Revenue Secretary for appointment of [REDACTED] as Multi-Tasking Staff-Trainee on compassionate ground has been examined by the Board in light of the rules/guidelines prescribed by DoP&T and also important Supreme Court's judgements in the matter of compassionate appointment.

b) In this case, it has been noted that the basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, the Govt. employee expired on [REDACTED]. It has been seen that the family has been able to sustain and manage their household expenses for almost 23 years till now with available financial resources. It has also been noted that the family received terminal benefits of [REDACTED] and wife of the deceased Govt. servant is in receipt of family pension of [REDACTED] per month i.e. [REDACTED] annually (including Dearness Relief which 42% currently). Further, the applicant was reading [REDACTED] but could not clear the 10th Class Examination till [REDACTED] after lapse of 20 years [REDACTED]. This tendency of the applicant for not acquiring the minimum education qualification even after 15 years since his application for compassionate appointment is [REDACTED] itself, a reason to believe that the applicant might not clear it after his engagement as Trainee who is already [REDACTED] years old now. In this connection, attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence." Further, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11/12/2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee."

c) The DoPT has also mentioned some rulings of the Supreme Courts at of their O.M. dated 02.08.2022 and has stated that these judgments may also be kept in view while considering cases of compassionate appointment. The relevant judgments in this regard are re-reproduced as under:

(i) The Supreme Court in its judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192] has held that appointment on grounds of descent clearly violates Article 16(2) of the Constitution; but if the appointment is confined to the son or daughter or widow of the Government Servant who died in harness and who needs immediate appointment on grounds of immediate need of assistance in the event of there being no other earning member in the family to supplement the loss of income from the bread winner to relieve the economic distress of the members of the family, it is unexceptionable.

(ii) The Supreme Court's judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Naqpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] has laid down the following important principles in this regard:

->> Only dependents of an employee dying in harness leaving his family in penury and without any means of livelihood can be appointed on compassionate ground.

->> The whole object of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden crisis and to relieve the family of the deceased from financial destitution and to help it get over the emergency.

->> Offering compassionate appointment as a matter of course irrespective of the financial condition of the family of the deceased or medically retired Government servant is legally impermissible.

(iii) The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu has observed that "an appointment made many years after the death of the employee or without due consideration of the financial resources available to his/her dependents and the financial deprivation caused to the dependents as a result of his death, simply because the claimant happened to be one of the dependents of the deceased employee would be directly in conflict with Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution and hence, quite bad and illegal. In dealing with cases of compassionate appointment, it is imperative to keep this vital aspect in mind".

d) Keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's aforesaid judgments and the facts provided by the O/o Pr CCIT WB & Sikkim, the instant case **does not deserve merit and hence could not be acceded to.**

4. In view of the above facts & circumstances, the Ld. Pr. CCIT, West Bengal & Sikkim directed the re-constituted Committee to consider the observations made by the Board in case of [REDACTED] (UR No 01/2017-18), [REDACTED] (UR No 05/1995-96) & [REDACTED] (UR No 16/1999-2000) at the time of making recommendations in the following cases namely:

[REDACTED] (UR No 11/2000-01)

[REDACTED] (UR No 05/1996-97)

[REDACTED] (UR No 32/2000-01)

[REDACTED] (UR No 23/2016-17)

Resolution No 1: The Re-constituted Committee, in view of the observations made by the Ld. Pr. CCIT, West Bengal & Sikkim, after perusal of submissions, affidavits and Inspector's Report in respect of following candidates who are not widow of the deceased Government employee & did not have the minimum required educational qualification i.e. Matriculation or equivalent and shortlisted due to their points awarded as per 'Scheme for compassionate appointment-100 Point Formula for assessment of applications for appointment on compassionate grounds', and recommended the following:

A) [REDACTED] (UR No: 11/2000-01):

a) In this case, the candidate passed the [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] but could not clear the 10th Class Examination till 2025, even after lapse [REDACTED] years since passing [REDACTED]. This tendency of the candidate of not acquiring the minimum education qualification even after [REDACTED] years since his application for compassionate appointment is [REDACTED] itself, a reason to believe that the candidate might not be able to acquire the minimum educational qualification even after his engagement as Trainee who is already [REDACTED] Years old now. Moreover, it has been noted that the basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, the Govt. employee expired on [REDACTED]. It has been observed that the family has been able to sustain and to manage their household expenses for almost [REDACTED] years till now with available financial resources. It has also been noted that the family received terminal benefits of [REDACTED] and the wife of the deceased Govt. servant is in receipt of family pension of [REDACTED] per month i.e., [REDACTED] annually (including Dearness Relief which 58% currently).

b) In this connection, attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence." Further, in recent Hon'ble

Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11.12.2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee."

c) Therefore, keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192], judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Nagpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] & judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu and the above mentioned facts, the Re-constituted Committee decided that the case of [REDACTED] does not deserve merit and hence could not be recommended for the appointment on Compassionate grounds for the post of Multi Tasking Staff (Trainee).

B) [REDACTED] (UR No: 05/1996-97):

a) In this case, the candidate passed the [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] and subsequently appeared & passed the [REDACTED] examination which is equivalent to Matriculation from the board [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] whereas the board [REDACTED] was de-recognised by the Department of Higher Education, Ministry of HRD, Government of India vide O.M. F. No. 11-15/2011/AR (TS. II) dated 06.12.2012 with effect from 01.06.2013. Since [REDACTED] she could not clear the 10th Class Examination till 2025, even after lapse [REDACTED] years since she appeared examination from the de-recognised board. This tendency of the candidate of not acquiring the minimum education qualification even after [REDACTED] years since her application for compassionate appointment [REDACTED], is itself, a reason to believe that the candidate might not be able to acquire the minimum educational qualification even after her engagement as Trainee who is already [REDACTED] years old now. Moreover, it has been noted that the basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, the Govt. employee expired on [REDACTED]. It has been observed that the family has been able to sustain and to manage their household expenses for almost [REDACTED] years till now with available financial resources. It has also been noted that the family received terminal benefits of Rs. [REDACTED] and the wife of the deceased Govt. servant is in receipt of family pension of [REDACTED] per month i.e., [REDACTED] annually (including Dearness Relief which 58% currently). The candidate herself working as DPL in the Department and is in receipt of Rs. [REDACTED]/- annually.

b) In this connection, attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence." Further, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11.12.2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee."

c) Therefore, keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192], judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Nagpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] & judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu and the above mentioned facts, the Re-constituted Committee decided that the case of [REDACTED] does not deserve merit and hence could not be recommended for the appointment on Compassionate grounds for the post of Multi Tasking Staff (Trainee).

C) [REDACTED] (UR No: 32/2000-01):

a) In this case, the candidate appeared for the [REDACTED] in the year [REDACTED] and could not clear the 10th Class Examination till 2025, even after lapse of [REDACTED] years. This tendency of the candidate of not acquiring the minimum education qualification even after [REDACTED] years since his application for compassionate appointment in [REDACTED] is itself, a reason to believe that the candidate might not be able to acquire the minimum educational qualification even after his engagement as Trainee who is already [REDACTED] Years old now. Moreover, it has been noted that the basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, the Govt. employee expired on [REDACTED]. It has been observed that the family has been able to sustain and to manage their household expenses for almost [REDACTED] years till now with available financial resources. It has also been noted that the family received terminal benefits of [REDACTED] and the wife of the deceased Govt. servant is in receipt of family pension of [REDACTED] per month i.e. [REDACTED] annually (including Dearness Relief which 58% currently).

b) In this connection, attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence." Further, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11.12.2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee."

c) Therefore, keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192], judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Nagpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] & judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu and the above mentioned facts, the Re-constituted Committee decided that the case of [REDACTED] does not deserve merit and hence could not be recommended for the appointment on Compassionate grounds for the post of Multi Tasking Staff (Trainee).

D) [REDACTED] (UR No: 23/2016-17):

a) In this case, the candidate appeared for the [REDACTED] Examination till 2025, even after lapse of [REDACTED] years. This tendency of the candidate of not acquiring the minimum education qualification even after [REDACTED] years since her application for compassionate appointment in [REDACTED] is itself, a reason to believe that the candidate might not be able to acquire the minimum educational qualification even after his engagement as Trainee who is already [REDACTED] Years old now. Moreover, it has been noted that the basic aim/objective of granting compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden financial crises. In the instant case, the Govt. employee expired on [REDACTED]. It has been observed that the family has been able to sustain and to manage their household expenses for almost [REDACTED] years till now with available financial resources. It has also been noted that the family received terminal benefits of [REDACTED] and the wife of the deceased Govt. servant is in receipt of family pension of [REDACTED] per month i.e. [REDACTED] annually (including Dearness Relief which 58% currently).

b) In this connection, attention is drawn to the principle laid down in the DoP&T guidelines that "The very fact that the family has been able to manage somehow all these years should normally be taken as adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence." Further, in recent Hon'ble Supreme Court's Judgment dated 11.12.2021, it has been mentioned that "Compassionate appointment is not a matter of right, but is to enable the family to tide over an immediate crisis which may result from the death of the employee."

c) Therefore, keeping in view of the DoP&T's guidelines, Hon'ble Supreme Court's judgment dated April 8, 1993 in the case of Auditor General of India and others vs. G. Ananta Rajeswara Rao [(1994) 1 SCC 192], judgment dated May 4, 1994 in the case of Umesh Kumar Nagpal Vs. State of Haryana and others [JT 1994(3) S.C. 525] & judgment dated 05.04.2011 in Civil Appeal No. 2206 of 2006 filed by Local Administrative Department vs. M.Selvanayagam @ Kumaravelu and the above mentioned facts, the Re-constituted Committee decided that the case of [REDACTED] does not deserve merit and hence could not be recommended for the appointment on Compassionate grounds for the post of Multi Tasking Staff (Trainee).

Resolution No 2: Vide resolution No 2 of the minutes of meeting dated 26.08.2025 the Re-constituted Committee recommended that [REDACTED] may be awarded with [REDACTED] points instead of [REDACTED]. Based on this revised point the Re-constituted Committee also recommended that the position of [REDACTED] in the merit list of Multi Tasking Staff is revised from Sl. No. 27 to Sl. No. 34 as per the rules and criteria followed by the Committee. For selecting eligible candidates for the post of Multi Tasking Staff having 26 vacancies, the eligibility list of the candidates went upto Sl. No. 27 as the candidate at Sl. No. 13 was selected for the post of Tax Assistant. As the case of [REDACTED] doesn't qualify for recommendation, the Re-constituted Committee also recommended that [REDACTED] (UR No 06/2011-12) whose name appears in the Sl. No. 27 of the revised merit list (Annexure 'O') for the post of Multi Tasking Staff, may be shortlisted for appointment on Compassionate ground against the vacancy of Recruitment Year 2023 for the post of Multi Tasking Staff.

Further, the above mentioned 04 cases namely, a) [REDACTED] (UR No 11/2000-01), b) [REDACTED] (UR No 05/1996-97), c) [REDACTED] (UR No 32/2000-01), d) [REDACTED] (UR No 23/2016-17) do not deserve merit and hence could not be recommended for the appointment on Compassionate grounds for the post of Multi Tasking Staff (Trainee). Accordingly, the Re-constituted Committee hereby recommends that the following candidates whose names appear in the Sl. No. 28 to 31 of the revised merit list (Annexure 'O') for the post of Multi Tasking Staff, may be considered for appointment on Compassionate ground for the post of Multi Tasking Staff against the vacancy of Recruitment Year as mentioned against their names:

Sl. No.	Sl. No. in the merit list of Multi tasking Staff	Unique Registration Number / Name of the Candidate Shri / Smt. / Ms.	D.O.B.	Date of Application	Relation / Name of the deceased employee / Last post held	Educational Qualification	Post / R.Y. considered for
01	28	16/2016-17 / [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Multi Tasking Staff / 2022
02	29	13/2017-18 / [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Multi Tasking Staff / 2022
03	30	08/1996-97 / [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Multi Tasking Staff / 2022
04	31	07/2001-02 / [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	Multi Tasking Staff / 2023

Resolution No 3: As per the recruitment rules for the Multi Tasking Staff, the upper age limit for recruitment is 25 yrs. There are 02 (two) candidates namely [REDACTED] (13/2017-18) & [REDACTED] (07/2001-02), among the above mentioned recommended candidates whose age at the time of application were more than the upper age limits mentioned in the respective recruitment rules i.e. above 25 Yrs at the time of their application.

As per para 6.B(a) of the '**Master Circular on Scheme of Compassionate Appointment**' '**Upper age limit could be relaxed wherever found to be necessary. The lower age limit should, however, in no case be relaxed below 18 years of age.**

Note I: Age eligibility shall be determined with reference to the date of application and not the date of appointment.

Note II: Authority Competent to take a final decision for making compassionate appointment in a case shall be competent to grant relaxation of upper age limit also for making such appointment.'

Therefore, the committee recommends that the Competent Authority may consider the same in those cases, before recruitment of the candidates on compassionate grounds.

5. The meeting closed with the vote of thanks from the Presenting Member.