

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

**WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN**

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 354 OF 2026**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred against the order dated 17/02/2026 in W.P.No.18895 of 2024 and pass on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

T. Jeevana Siri, D/o. Late Thota Bhaskar, Aged about 25 years, Occ. unemployed R/o H.No.2-58/2, SC Colony, Rudragudem, (Village), Nallabelli Mandal, Warangal District-506 349.

**...APPELLANT/WRIT PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Medical Health and Family Welfare Department, Dr. B R Ambedkar Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad - 500 022.
2. The Director, Medical Education, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad.
3. The Superintendent, MGM Hospital, Warangal, Warangal District.
4. The Collector and District Magistrate, Warangal, Warangal District.

**...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS**

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation of the order dated 02.07.2024 issued by the 3rd respondent, pending final adjudication of the Writ Appeal.

**Counsel for the Appellant: SRI SHREYAS REDDY YALAGIRI  
Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR SERVICES-I**

**The Court made the following: JUDGMENT**

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA**  
**AT HYDERABAD**

**THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH**  
**AND**  
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN**

**WRIT APPEAL No.354 of 2026**

**Dated: 25.03.2026**

**Between:**

T.Jeevana Siri

**...Appellant**

**and**

The State of Telangana,  
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
Medical, Health & Family Welfare Department,  
Dr. B.R Ambedkar Telangana Secretariat,  
Hyderabad – 500 022,  
and 3 others.

**...Respondents**

**JUDGMENT:**

Learned counsel Sri Shreyas Reddy.Y appears for the appellant.

Sri Santhapur Satyanarayana Rao, learned Government Pleader  
for Services-I, appears for the respondents.

2. The present writ appeal is preferred against the judgment dated 17.02.2026 passed by the learned writ court dismissing W.P.No.18895 of 2024 preferred by the appellant herein.

3. Upon the death of the appellant's father in harness on 17.07.2018 while working as a Male Nursing Orderly at MGM Hospital, Warangal, the family of the appellant obtained a certificate from the revenue authorities recognising them as dependants on 04.09.2018 and also got a declaration from the civil court in O.S.No.115 of 2018 of their legal heirship for the purposes of compassionate appointment vide judgment dated 30.07.2019. Thereafter, the widow i.e., the appellant's mother applied for compassionate appointment of her daughter i.e., the appellant, on 07.09.2018. The appellant's mother contracted a second marriage on 26.11.2021. Thereafter, the appellant and her brother obtained another decree in O.S.No.148 of 2022 declaring them as legal heirs of the deceased. A family member certificate was also issued on 17.01.2023 reflecting the subsequent developments. The application for compassionate appointment of the appellant sponsored by her mother was rejected on 05.12.2023 on the grounds that the appellant's mother is a government employee and the family is not in financial distress and also eligible for death-cum-retiral benefits of the deceased. An

application was preferred by the appellant on 15.12.2023 seeking reconsideration of her case on the grounds that the appellant's mother incurred second marriage and a decree was obtained in O.S.No.148 of 2022 about their legal heirship after the second marriage of her mother. That the socio-economic status certificate and die-in-harness certificate entitled her claim to be considered independently. The same was rejected by respondent No.3 on 02.07.2024, which was under challenge in the writ petition.

4. The learned writ court dismissed the writ petition on the ground that the scheme of compassionate appointment provides that if there is no other earning member, a dependent suffering from indigent condition would be employed in Government service. The scheme requires an application within one year from the date of death. The application initially filed was rejected on tenable grounds. Thereafter, no fresh application can be entertained. The immediacy of the hardship has ceased to exist. Being aggrieved, the appellant has preferred the present appeal.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant has referred to the decision of the Apex Court in **Saurabh Chourasiya v. The State of Madhya Pradesh** (SLP (Civil) Diary No.26461 of 2022, dated 27.08.2024). It is

submitted that the rejection of the petitioner's claim therein was on hyper technical grounds which have been frowned by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

6. However, a perusal of the decision in the case of **Saurabh Chourasiya** (supra) shows that the application for compassionate appointment was made after seven years of the death immediately upon attaining majority by the petitioner. It was rejected on the ground that as not presented within time. The Apex Court in those circumstances held that the rejection of the case of the petitioner was on hyper technical grounds. He had filed the application immediately after attaining majority. In the peculiar facts, the competent authority was, therefore, directed to again consider the application of the petitioner on merit without rejecting the same on the ground of being filed beyond seven years of the death of the bread earner.

7. The present case is not one of the appellant applying after some delay on attaining the majority. The application sponsoring the appellant's name was made by her mother after the death of the appellant's father though after the one year period but before the appellant's mother incurred the second marriage. The claim of the appellant was rejected on the ground that her mother was a government

employee and the family was not in financial distress. After rejection of the claim on 05.12.2023, the appellant has filed an application seeking reconsideration of her case independently. The application is after considerable lapse of the time stipulated for making the application. The family has apparently survived for about five years till the review application was made. In such circumstances, the learned writ court was right in holding that once the claim of the appellant made earlier was rejected on tenable grounds, a second claim by the same party and that too much after the stipulated period cannot be entertained especially when the family has survived the immediate distress..

8. Learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents has placed reliance upon a recent decision rendered by this Court in **The Senior Scientist and Head, JVRHRS v. Smt. K.Bhagyalaxmi** (W.A.No.814 of 2025, dated 21.11.2025), where such a claim was rejected on grounds of delay.

9. Upon consideration of rival submissions of the parties and the materials placed on record, we, therefore, do not find any error in the impugned order warranting interference in letters patent jurisdiction.

10. Accordingly, the writ appeal is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

**SD/- L.LAKSHMI BABU  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**//TRUE COPY//**

**SECTION OFFICER**

**To**

1. One CC to SRI SHREYAS REDDY YALAGIRI, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to GP FOR SERVICES-I, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
3. Two CD Copies

PSK.

TKS

*R*

**HIGH COURT**

**DATED:25/03/2026**

**JUDGMENT**

**WA.No.354 of 2026**



**DISMISSING THE WRIT APPEAL  
WITHOUT COSTS**

*6 copies  
18-  
2/4/26*