

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CWP No. 15087 of 2015 (O & M)

Date of decision: 17.08.2015

Bhushan Sharma

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. JPS Sidhu, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)

C.M. No. 10362 of 2015

Application for placing on record Annexure P-7 is allowed,
subject to all just exceptions.

The said Annexure is taken on record.

CWP No. 15087 of 2015

Prayer made in the present writ petition is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner in government job on compassionate grounds as per State Government policy regarding appointments of Honour and Gratitude as the petitioner is dependent of the deceased government employee killed in action by the terrorists.

It is the case of the petitioner that his uncle SPO Harpal Singh (Belt No. 632) S/o Baldev Singh was employed as SPO in Punjab Police in District Bathinda. While on duty at the New Bank of India, Village Kotha Guru, District Bathinda, he was killed by terrorists on 23.04.1993. The family of the petitioner was declared as Punjab Police Martyr's Family and

the Identity Card was issued to the family of the petitioner. Reference is made to the certificate (Annexure P-2) issued to the father of the petitioner who is the brother of the deceased. It is submitted that at that time, no family member was eligible for appointment and the claim of the petitioner's family was kept pending and no action was taken even though similarly placed persons namely Hardeep Singh and one Ajaib Singh were appointed. The petitioner's case is that on 27.07.2013 (Annexure P-3), he has applied through his father to respondent no. 2.

Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the order passed by respondent no. 2 dated 03.09.2014 (Annexure P-7) to show that the case of the petitioner is liable to be considered as Rehabilitation and Welfare of Martyr's Family is a continuous process and he would be satisfied if a decision is taken within a time bound frame.

Resultantly, keeping in view the limited relief claimed, this Court does not feel it necessary to call upon the State to file reply.

Accordingly, without commenting on the merits of the case and whether he has any legal right or entitlement, this Court is of the opinion that it would be appropriate if respondent no. 2 takes a decision on the representation dated 27.07.2013 (Annexure P-3) within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order.

With the above said observations, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

17.08.2015
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)
JUDGE