

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

247

**CWP-25455-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision:21.04.2018**

Sheetal Kumar @ Sheetal Puri

...Petitioner

Versus

State Bank of Patiala and another

.... Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H.N.Mehtani, Advocate for respondents No.1 and 2.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (ORAL)

In the instant writ petition, petitioner's grievance is that she is entitled for compassionate appointment. In the reply statement filed by the respondents it is pointed out that petitioner is not entitled to compassionate appointment in view of the policy. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is entitled to ex-gratia instead of compassionate appointment with reference to the policy decision. In this regard, concerned respondent is hereby directed to take a decision if the petitioner is otherwise eligible for ex-gratia benefit. In that event respondent is hereby directed to extend the ex-gratia benefit within a period of two months. If the petitioner is not entitled to ex-gratia also in that event necessary order be passed and communicate the same to the petitioner within a period of 2 months from the receipt of this order.

With the above observation, CWP stands disposed of.

21.04.2018

pooja saini

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

Whether speaking/reasons

Yes/No

Whether Reportable:

Yes/No