

211

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

CWP No.2 of 2020

Date of Decision: 06.08.2022

RAGHU MEHTO

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Pankaj Mulwani, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.3.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.(Oral)

On 07.01.2020, following order was passed by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court:-

“Report dated 04.01.2020 of the Permanent Medical Board, PGIMER, Chandigarh furnished in Court today is taken on record subject to just exceptions. As per the said report, medical termination of pregnancy (MTP) at the advanced gestational age (24 week and 5 days) is not advisable.

*Learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, submits that the petitioner in any case would be entitled to compensation and other measures as detailed in the case of **Sikander versus State of Haryana and others, 2018 (3) Law Herald 2583.***

Learned counsel for the State prays for some time to seek specific instructions in this respect.

List on 14.01.2020.

To be taken up immediately after the urgent matters.

*January 07, 2020
rts”*

**(Lisa Gill)
Judge**

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not contacted his office for the last more than two years and he has no instructions.

Keeping in view the duration of pregnancy as on 07.01.2020, the victim must have delivered the child. For the relief of compensation, if any, as per the Government policy, the same can be claimed by the petitioner in accordance with law for which liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach the concerned authority.

In the event of submitting such a claim, the competent authority shall consider the claim of the petitioner in accordance with the policy/Rules.

Disposed of with the liberty aforesaid.

August 06, 2022
Atik

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No