

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

251

CWP-4184-2022 (O & M)

Date of Decision: March 30, 2022

LALITA PANDEY

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Ms.Vibha Nagar, Advocate for
Mr. D.S.Saini, Advocate the petitioner.

Mr. C.L. Pawar, Sr. DAG, Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr. Vijay Kumar Kaushal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the application of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds has been erroneously rejected on the ground that the petitioner is married daughter of the deceased even though a married son would be entitled to compassionate appointment and the respondents, therefore, cannot discriminate on the basis of gender which would be in violation of Article 14, 15 and 16 of the Constitution of India. She has relied upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Bhuvaneshwari V. Purani Vs. State of Karnataka (2021) 1 AKR 444 (AIR Online 2020 Kar 2303)** and the judgment of the coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Amarjit Kaur Vs. State of Punjab and another, CWP No.2218 of 2017, decided on 17.01.2020.** She further submits that the petitioner has sent a legal notice dated 23.10.2021 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2 in this regard and would be satisfied if this petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to decide the legal notice in the light of the aforementioned judgments.

The petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the legal notice (Annexure P-4) in the light of the afore-noted judgments and other relevant material and take a decision in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

March 30, 2022
A.Kaundal

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