

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

**CWP No. 11051 of 2015 (O & M)**

**Date of decision: 12.01.2016**

Rohit Sharma @ Rohit Kumar

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

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

Present: None for the petitioner.

Ms. Monica Chhiber Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

**G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J. (Oral)**

**C.M. No. 8426 of 2015**

Application for placing on record reply by way of counter affidavit on behalf of respondents no. 1 to 4 is allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The same is taken on record.

**CWP No. 11051 of 2015**

The present petition challenges the order dated 08.01.2013 (Annexure P-6) vide which, the petitioner's claim for employment on account of the Rehabilitation and Resettlement Scheme dated 18.11.1993 has been rejected.

Though the claim has been rejected on the ground that the petitioner's father was not owner of 7 marlas of land on the cut off date on 01.05.1986, but in the written statement filed, it has been mentioned that the employment was also given to the father wrongly. It is not disputed that the appointment was also given on 26.10.1995 more than two decades earlier

and the appointment orders are attached as Annexure R-1. The petitioner got the reconsideration by this Court by filing CWP No. 18434 of 2011 in which he was one of the 35 petitioners. This Court directed on 29.09.2011 to consider the case of the petitioners, which has led to the passing of the impugned order. The factum of the employment given to the father has not been denied by filing any replication on account of the fact that one member of the family has benefitted. Even otherwise, though as averred, he was not entitled for the benefit but the fact remains that the family has benefitted for the last two decades. Solely because reconsideration was directed in Dharam Singh's case in the year 2011, the petitioner sought reconsideration on similar grounds without bringing to the notice of the Court that his father already stood employed.

In such circumstances, on account of concealment of facts and even otherwise also, the petitioner's case is without any merit and accordingly, the same is dismissed.

12.01.2016  
shivani

(G.S. SANDHAWALIA)  
JUDGE