



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 6th OF JANUARY, 2026

WRIT PETITION No. 39826 of 2025

VED PRAKASH CHATURVEDI
Versus
THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS

Appearance:

Shri Ahadulla Usmani, learned counsel with Shri H.S. Pateria, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Shri B.D. Singh, learned Deputy Advocate General for the respondent/State.

ORDER

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

1. Subject petition has been styled as *public interest litigation* seeking to challenge the compassionate appointment given to respondent no.8.

2. The petition states that the petitioner is a journalist and claims to have no personal interest in the matter. As per the petition, the compassionate appointment was given to respondent no.8 on the demise of his father. It is stated that the father of the respondent no.8 expired in the year 1965 and subject compassionate appointment was done in the year 1989. The present petition has been filed in the year 2025, after 36 years of appointment. We note that along with the petition certain representations



have been filed as Annexure P-6 which were given to Collector as well as right to information application, all in respect of compassionate appointment of respondent no.8. The representation as well as RTI application has been made by one Dev Narayan Tiwari. It is noticed that Dev Narayan Tiwari is real brother of respondent no.8.

3. Clearly, the subject petition is a motivated petition and there appears to be a dispute between brothers. The documents of Dev Narayan Tiwari are being used by the petition to target respondent no.8. First of all the present petition is highly belated and impugns the compassionate appointment given thirty six years ago and secondly, it uses complaints and documents of the brother of respondent no.8.

4. Apparently, the present petition is a motivated petition and has been filed by the petitioner at the behest of brother of respondent no.8.

5. In view of the above facts, we are not inclined to entertain the subject petition and same is consequently dismissed.

(SANJEEV SACHDEVA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(VINAY SARAF)
JUDGE