

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

116

CWP-13391-2022

Date of decision : 13.09.2022

Kulwinder Kaur

... Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

.. Respondents

CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Arunjeet Singh Kakkar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has challenged the order (Annexure P-4) whereby her claim for compassionate appointment has been declined.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the husband of the petitioner, who was working as an ALM with the respondent/PSPCL, had expired while in service and therefore, she would be entitled to appointment on compassionate grounds. He also submits that the petitioner has not been paid any compensation.

Heard.

It is apparent that the husband of the petitioner had been working as an ALM on contractual basis. He had been worked for two years when he had unfortunately expired. The respondents have rejected the claim of the petitioner on the ground that the scheme for compassionate appointment would not be applicable to the legal heirs of contractual employees. The husband of the petitioner in the instant case had worked only for two years on contractual basis and therefore, I do not find any infirmity in the impugned order.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not come in the way of the petitioner for seeking recourse to alternative remedy available to her under the law.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

September 13, 2022
sonia gugnani

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