



IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT JABALPUR

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA,
CHIEF JUSTICE

&

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VINAY SARAF

ON THE 5th OF JANUARY, 2026

WRIT APPEAL No. 2668 of 2025

SUNIL KUMAR NAMDEO

Versus

BANK OF BARODA AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri M.K. Mishra - Advocate for the appellant.

Shri Anoop Nair - Senior Advocate with Ms. Aparna Sthapak - Advocate for the respondents

ORDER

Per. Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjeev Sachdeva, Chief Justice

The appellant impugns order dated 04.08.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No.7085/2022, whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant seeking compassionate appointment on the demise of his father has been dismissed.

2. The father of the appellant was employed with the respondent-Bank and expired while in service on 14.01.2015. An application for compassionate appointment was made by the appellant which was rejected on 23.12.2016 (Annexure R/1) on the ground that the appellant was not found to be indigent and did not require immediate assistance for relief. It was found that the appellant was not in financial distress in terms of the



scheme for compassionate appointment. The relevant policy applicable in this regard is the policy dated 18.02.2016.

3. It is not in dispute that the brother of the appellant is in a permanent job. On the demise of father of the appellant, a sum of Rs.25.48 Lakhs was received by the family. In the application form, the appellant has also mentioned that there is an investment by way of deposit amounting to Rs.10,00,000/- besides a life insurance policy. The appellant in the application form has further stated his occupation as electrician and his monthly income of Rs.3,500/-.

4. The learned Single Judge has duly considered the financial status of the family, the amount received as well as occupation status of the appellant and noticed that there was a delay on behalf of the appellant in approaching the Court. Subject petition was filed after seven years of the demise of the father. The writ Court has noticed that there is no immediate need of the family requiring benefit of compassionate appointment.

5. Keeping in view the fact that the family received an amount exceeding Rs.25,00,000/- and had a deposit of Rs.10,00,000/- and further admittedly both the appellant and his brother were employed/having monthly income, we are of the view that there is no infirmity in the decision taken by the respondent-bank in holding that the appellant did not appear to be indigent, the family did not require any immediate assistance and was not in a financial distress as required by the Scheme for compassionate appointment. We find no infirmity in the view taken by the learned Single Judge in upholding the decision of the authority.



6. In view of above, we find no merit in the appeal. The appeal is consequently dismissed.

**(SANJEEV SACHDEVA
CHIEF JUSTICE**

**(VINAY SARAF)
JUDGE**

C