

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

131

CWP-29711-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision:22.12.2017

Dharam Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.... Respondents

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

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

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

Matter relates to compassionate appointment. As is evident from the records deceased employee had submitted his resignation on 08.07.2013 and it was accepted. Consequently, deceased employee's services were relieved on 08.07.2013 from Malerkotla Office. Thereafter, on 18.07.2013 he is died. In view of the above facts and circumstances, petitioner has no right to claim compassionate appointment in view of the Scheme for Compassionate Appointment in Public Sector General Insurance Companies to the extent of para 1 relating to Coverage. It is crystal clear from the Coverage clause that compassionate appointment would be considered to a dependent family member of a permanent employee of a Public Sector General Insurance Company (PSGIC) who dies while in service (including death by suicide) or is retired on medical grounds due to incapacitation before reaching the age of 55 years etc. Petitioner's case do not fall under Clause 1 of Scheme for Compassionate Appointment in

Public Sector General Insurance Companies in view of the fact that deceased employee had submitted his resignation and it was accepted. Therefore, petitioner has not made out a case so as to interfere with the relief sought by the petitioner.

Accordingly, CWP stands dismissed. Reserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the action of the respondents insofar as acceptance of resignation.

22.12.2017

pooja saini

**(P.B.BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasons: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No