

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.23710 of 2015

Date of Decision:- 11.08.2016.

Ravi Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

The State Bank of Patiala and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.N. Mehtani, Advocate for the respondents.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has questioned the order dated 21.7.2014 (Annexure P-2) by which petitioner's claim for compassionate appointment has been declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as per existing policy as on the date of the petitioner's father death, petitioner is not entitled for compassionate appointment. Petitioner's presumption is that the respondents-Bank have adopted new policy and as per the new policy, he is entitled to be appointed on compassionate ground.

Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that they have not adopted new policy so as to consider name of the petitioner for compassionate appointment. The same is not disputed by the petitioner's counsel. Since the petitioner's claim for compassionate appointment under

the existing policy is impermissible, therefore, there is no infirmity in the order dated 21.7.2014 (Annexure P-2).

Hence, the petition stands dismissed.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

August 11, 2016.

sandeep sethi

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.