

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT  
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.2294 of 2015

Date of Decision:24/04/2015

Amandeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL**

Present: Mr. H.S. Batth, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. To be referred to the reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest.

**DEEPAK SIBAL, J.**

Through the present writ petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 8.6.2009/12.6.2009 (Annexure P-10) whereby the case of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds has been rejected by the respondent-Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "the Corporation"). The petitioner further prays for issuance of a direction to the respondent-Corporation to appoint him on compassionate grounds on account of the death of his father.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and going through the record of the case, I am disinclined to grant the above reliefs to the petitioner. The whole object to grant compassionate appointment is to enable the family to tide over the sudden crises of having lost its sole bread winner. The object is not to give a post to the family of the deceased employee but is to relieve the family of the sudden financial destitution.

In the case in hand, the father of the petitioner died on 7.12.2007 and the order through which the request of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate basis had been rejected by the respondent-

Corporation was passed in June 2009. The present writ petition has been filed after an unexplained delay of over 7 years after the death of the father of the petitioner and nearly 6 years after the passing of the order rejecting the case of the petitioner. At this stage the relief of compassionate appointment cannot be granted to the petitioner as the same would be against the very object for granting such appointment.

Further, a perusal of the impugned order rejecting the case of the petitioner as also the Will of the petitioner's father shows that at the time of death, the petitioner's father had left behind both movable and immovable properties, house, shops, land as also amounts lying in the Bank in favour of his family. This fact has nowhere been disputed in the present petition.

That being so, it is clear that the financial state of the petitioner's family at the time of the death of his father was not such which would warrant the issuance of direction to the respondents to grant appointment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds especially when the applicable rules of the respondent-corporation provide that compassionate appointment is to be given to a family member of the deceased employee who dies in harness only if on account of such death their family has been thrown into a financial crisis.

Still further, the petitioner claims appointment on compassionate basis on the ground that he is the adopted son of late Bahadar Singh who was an employee of the respondent-corporation. However, the fact of the adoption of the petitioner by the above said Bahadar Singh has been disputed by the respondent-corporation in the impugned order. Whether the petitioner was the adopted son of late Bahadar Singh or not would require leading of elaborate evidence which cannot be

gone into by me while exercising my jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

In view of the above, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is ordered to be dismissed.

No costs.

**( DEEPAK SIBAL )**  
**JUDGE**

**24.04.2015**  
**rajeev**