

**RA-425-2015 (O&M) in
CWP No.26683 of 2014**

#1#

Manoj Kumar
2018.05.18 11:39
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

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

**RA-425-2015 (O&M) in
CWP No.26683 of 2014**

Ramandeep Singh

...Applicant-petitioner

Versus

The Principal Secretary Transport Deptt Haryana & Anr

....Respondents

Date of Order: 14.5.2018

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr. Rajbir Singh, AAG Haryana for the applicant/
respondent-State.

Mr. Jatin Salwan, Advocate for non-applicant/petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL, J (ORAL)

CM No.13605 of 2015

For the reasons stated in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the same is allowed. Delay of 124 days in filing the petition is condoned.

CWP No.26683 of 2014

Applicant-respondents/State has preferred instant application for reviewing order dated 08.5.2015 passed by this Court vide which the writ petition bearing CWP No.26683 was disposed of by observing as under:

“It is seen that the wards of the persons who died in harness are compelled to approach this Court every day or other specifically to seek compassionate

appointment but the respondents are not taking any action despite the fact that there has been a judgment rendered by the Full Bench in Krishna Kumari 's case (supra) . I do not deem it appropriate to issue notice of motion instead issue a direction to the respondents to give appointment to the petitioner subject to requisite qualification and eligibility on the basis of policy for compassionate/ex-gratia appointment which was in vogue when the father of the petitioner died strictly in accordance with the principles culled out in the aforementioned judgment.

The respondents may offer an appointment to the petitioner within a period of four months.”

What propelled the applicant-respondents to move this application is the clarification of the order dated 08.5.2015 to the effect whether 2004 Policy would be applicable or the Policy which was in vogue at the time of submission of the application on behalf of the non-applicant/petitioner.

Since there was difference of opinion in **Krishna Kumari's case (supra)**, I am of the view that it is a fit case where the matter requires re-consideration.

Resultantly, the application is allowed. Order dated 08.5.2015 is recalled and the writ petition bearing CWP No.26683 is ordered to be listed as per Roster.

May 14, 2018
manoj

^(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No