

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

CWP-15388 of 2010

Date of decision: 04.12.2019

Neelam Sharma

.... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Sourabh Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Safia Gupta, AAG, Haryana.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that though, in the present writ petition, the petitioner has already challenged letter dated 15.09.2009 (Annexure P/12-A), by which the benefit of compassionate appointment was declined and sanction for sum of Rs.2.5 lacs as ex-gratia has been ordered in favour of the petitioner, but during the pendency of the present writ petition, respondents have issued another Instructions dated 02.08.2019, according to which, the benefit of compassionate appointment can be granted to the family of the deceased employee.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner will be satisfied in case, the petitioner is given liberty to approach the respondents for the grant of benefits under Instructions dated 02.08.2019.

The present writ petition is disposed of with the direction to the respondents that in case any representation is filed by the petitioner,

claiming the benefit under the Instructions dated 02.08.2019, the same will be decided by passing an appropriate speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of said representation. In case, the petitioner still feels aggrieved by the order of the respondents, she will be at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy available to her. It is made clear that this Court expresses no opinion on the merits of the case or the claim being raised by the petitioner at this stage.

Disposed of, with liberty, as prayed for.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

04.12.2019

aarti

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/non-speaking? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable? | Yes/No |