

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

CWP No. 9851 of 2015(O&M)

Date of decision : 18.05.2015

Sanjeev Kumar and another

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana High Court and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr. Balraj Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

Father of the petitioner was working in HSMITC. He died in the year 2002. The petitioner was a minor but his mother was eligible for seeking compassionate appointment. She did not do so. In 2003 HSMITC was closed down. In 2007 the petitioner attained majority and sought compassionate appointment. That having been declined he moved CWP No. 21451 of 2008 in this Court and the same was disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the representation dated 14.07.2008 wherein the petitioner had sought compassionate appointment. By order dated 16.03.2009 that application was rejected on the ground that the petitioner had sought compassionate appointment in a corporation which had closed down.

The present petition has been filed now after more than six years

claiming that even if the petitioner could not have been granted compassionate appointment he should have been granted compensation.

I am afraid this petition suffers from inordinate delay and latches. In case after case Courts have held that the benefit of compassionate appointment/compassionate assistance can be granted to tide over an immediate crisis suffered by a family whose sole bread winner has died. Juxtaposed against this exposition of law this delay of 6 years and 2 months is very fatal.

No other argument has been raised.

Petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the Civil Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

May 18, 2015
sunita