

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20267 of 2018
Date of Decision:16.08.2018

Om Parkash Gupta

..... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: - Mr.Deepak Sonak, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

This petition is filed for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for considering the case of the petitioner for grant of monthly pension in terms of the notification dated 7.12.2017 issued by the Department of Information, Public Relations and Languages, Haryana.

In brief, the petitioner is working as a media person/reporter since 1992. The Government of Haryana issued a notification on 7.12.2017 approving the scheme for providing monthly pension of ₹10,000/- to the accredited media persons of daily, evening, weekly, fortnightly, monthly newspapers, news agencies, radio stations and news channels, above the age of 60 years. The eligibility criteria for seeking pension was also provided in the said notification, which read as under: -

“A) Eligibility Criteria:

- 1. The accredited media persons of daily, evening, weekly, fortnightly, monthly newspapers, news agencies, radio stations, news channels with at least*

20 years of experience in the field of journalism and above the age of 60 years.

- 2. The media person should have accredited with the Information, Public Relations & Languages Department, Haryana for at least last five years.”*

The petitioner made an application at the Chief Minister window for grant of monthly pension alleging that he is fully eligible as per the notification but he has been informed that *“as per the notification of the pension scheme No.8/367/2017-3P dated 7.12.2017, there is a provision of grant of monthly pension to the accredited media persons of Haryana, above the age of 60 years having 20 years experience in the field of journalism with 5 years accreditation. Mr. Om Parkash Gupta does not fulfill the condition of 5 years accreditation, as he never remained accredited with this department. He has given general suggestion in his complaint that the condition of 5 years accreditation to grant of monthly pension not to be considered mandatory. Thus, the present complaint has been filed”*.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not denied that the petitioner does not fulfill the condition of 5 years accreditation which is otherwise a *sine qua non* and has argued that recognition and accreditation is the same thing.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record with his able assistance. The pension scheme categorically lays down the eligibility criteria as per which it is available to the accredited media

Information, Public Relations and Languages, Haryana for at least 5 years.

The petitioner has no such qualification therefore, he is absolutely ineligible.

In view of the above, I do not find any error on the part of the respondents in not granting pension to the petitioner as claimed by him in terms of the notification dated 7.12.2017 and hence, the writ petition is hereby dismissed though without any order as to costs.

16.08.2018

Vivek

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable : *Yes/No*