

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-10354-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 15.05.2017

Laxmi

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldeep Singh

Present: Mr.Sandeep Singal, Advocate for the petitioner

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldeep Singh, J. (Oral)

Heard.

It is stated that husband of the petitioner had worked as a part time sweeper from 9.5.2007 to 9.4.2016 for two hours daily. Petitioner claims compassionate financial assistance. She has challenged the policy dated 27.11.2014 (Annexure P3), vide which, compassionate financial assistance was extended to the families of the deceased persons working in the Haryana Government on ad hoc basis, daily wage basis, contract basis, including the persons on contract basis working for the service providing agency, which was further extended to guest teachers working in the government schools vide police instructions dated 28.7.2016.

I am of the view that the policy dated 27.11.2014 (Annexure P3) shows that the government has made a reasonable classification so as to include ad hoc, daily wage and contract service on the ground that they were

working for whole time. Here the husband of the petitioner worked only for two hours a day and cannot be equated with a employee who worked for whole of the day. Policy regarding guest teachers was brought into force on 28.7.2016 i.e. after the death of the husband of the petitioner which occurred on 9.4.2016. Moreover, case of the guest teachers cannot be equated with a sweeper working for two hours in a school. Terms of the appointment of guest teachers are not on the file to show what were their conditions of work.

In view of the matter, I am of the view that the petitioner cannot claim equality with the ad hoc, daily wages and contract employees. The Government can make a reasonable classification by excluding part time employees who worked only for particular hours.

There are no merits in the preset writ petition. The same is accordingly dismissed.

15.05.2017

gk

**(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No