

CWP No. 24679 of 2015

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 24679 of 2015
Date of Decision : 25.05.2016

Amandeep Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

...Respondents

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

- 1) *Whether Reporters of the 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?*

Present: Mr. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

P.B. Bajanthri, J.(Oral)

In the present petition, the petitioner has questioned the order/communication dated 25.07.2014 passed by respondent No. 2 by which claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment has been rejected.

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner's father (deceased Harbans Singh) joined service on 09.11.1979. He died on 08.03.2005. It is stated that on 26.02.2006 the petitioner moved an application for compassionate appointment. The respondents have rejected claim of the petitioner on 30.04.2010. Thereafter petitioner approached the respondents by making representation for re-consideration to appoint him on compassionate ground. On 25.07.2014 once

again, claim of the petitioner had been rejected with reference to the compassionate appointment Rules.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that rejection of the petitioner's claim for compassionate appointment vide Communication dated 30.04.2010 and 25.07.2014 is highly arbitrary, therefore, it is to be set-aside.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Having regard to the fact that petitioner's father passed away on 08.03.2005 and the petitioner was pursuing claim of compassionate appointment from 2006 to 2015, which indicates that there is no hardness in the family so as to seek compassionate appointment. The petitioner has failed to question the rejection of his claim for compassionate appointment vide communication dated 30.04.2010, thereafter he slept over the matter for nearly four years. Ultimately, a decision was taken by the respondents for the second time on 25.07.2014 in which claim of the petitioner has been rejected. Even thereafter petitioner has taken one year time to approach this Court. Claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment is highly belated one. On this ground, the present petition stands dismissed.

May 25, 2016.
kanchan

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE