

Sr. No.138

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

CWP No.18865 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 15.07.2019

Vimla Devi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present:- Mr. H.P.S.Ghuman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ARUN MONGA, J.(ORAL)

The petitioner is mother-in-law of respondent No.6. Her grievance is that, being a widow, respondent No.6 is seeking undue benefit of seeking compassionate appointment as her husband died in harness while serving as 'Teacher' in the Department of Education, Government of Punjab.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that respondent No.6 did not have good relations with her husband and was also not dependent upon him at the time of his death.

It is also stated in the petition that various matrimonial litigations are going on between respondent No.6 and her husband, therefore, respondent No.6 is not entitled to seek appointment on compassionate grounds.

A writ in the nature of prohibition has been sought from

this Court restraining the official respondents to not grant any appointment to respondent No.6 apart from certain other relief.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the contents of the petition along with Annexures appended thereto.

Concededly, respondent No.6 has so far not been granted any benefit of appointment on compassionate grounds. At best, per allegations in the petition, she is trying to get the job as per the relevant applicable Policy of Government of Punjab for granting the benefit of compassionate appointment qua those employees who die in harness.

Without commenting on the merits of the allegations against respondent No.6 as contained herein, I am of the view that the present writ petition not only suffers from the vice of lack of locus standi, even otherwise, same has been filed prematurely and that too for mitigation of certain grievances of the petitioner arising out of her prejudice against her daughter-in-law.

In the premise, no grounds to invoke in the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction of this Court vested under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are made out.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

In the parting, however, it is further observed that the dismissal of the writ petition would not, in any case, be construed as approval of this Court on the claim of respondent No.6 to seek compassionate appointment. The official respondents shall proceed with representation/application of respondent No.6, if

any, in accordance with law, as per applicable Government Policy.

15.07.2019
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No