

115

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

1)

CWP-9327-2018  
Date of Decision:11.12.2023

RAMESH KUMAR AND OTHERS

..... Petitioners

Versus

BBMB AND ORS

..... Respondents

2)

CWP-5670-2015

SIDDHARTH SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

.....Respondents

3)

CWP-8960-2019

NUSARAT ALI

.....Petitioner

Versus

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD, AND ORS

.....Respondents

4)

CWP-14213-2019

SUBHASH CHAND

.....Petitioner

Versus

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

5)

CWP-17956-2019

SHASHI PAL

.....Petitioner

Versus

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

6)

CWP-15663-2019

ROHIT KUMAR AND OTHERS

.....Petitioners

Versus

BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND OTHERS

.....Respondents

7)

CWP-3673-2020

PARVEEN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Versus

**CWP-9327-2018 and all connected cases.** **2**  
**2023:PHHC:157853**

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND ORS**  
.....Respondents

8) **CWP-3610-2020**

**VINOD KUMAR** .....Petitioner

*Versus*

**BHAKRA BEAS MANAGEMENT BOARD AND ORS**  
.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present : Mr. H.S. Saini, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CWP-9327-2018 CWP-8960-  
2019, CWP-3673-2020, CWP-17956-2019  
& CWP-3610-2020.

Mr. Ramneek Vasudeva, Advocate  
for the petitioner in CWP-5670-2015.

Mr. Saurabh Arora, Advocate  
for the petitioners in CWP-14213-2019 & CWP-15663-2019.

Mr. Karan Nehra, Advocate  
for the respondents.

Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
for respondents in CWP-3673-2020 & CWP-3610-2020.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)**

1. By this common order CWP-5670-2015, CWP-9327-2018, CWP-8960-2019, CWP-14213-2019, CWP-17956-2019, CWP-15663-2019, CWP-3673-2020 and CWP-3610-2020 are disposed of since issue involved in all the petitions and prayer sought are common. With the consent of parties and for the sake of brevity, facts are borrowed from CWP-9327-2018.

2. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking compassionate appointment.

3. At the time of death of the employee, policy of 2005 was in vogue. As per said policy, the family members of the deceased employee

were entitled to lump-sum compensation of Rs.3 lakhs. The Respondent-Board in 2012 came out with a fresh compassionate policy. In the said policy, an option was given to family members of the deceased employee either to opt for job or lump-sum compensation. The policy was applicable with respect to employees who passed away on or after 16.04.2010. The employees herein have passed away prior to 2010, thus, family members are not entitled to benefit of compassionate policy of 2012.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-BBMB, at the outset, submits that Board in its 245<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 11.09.2023 has adopted compassionate policy applicable to employees of Punjab State Power Corporation Limited. He further submits that rate of interest with respect to refund of already paid money has been reduced from 12% to 7.10.%. The respondent undertakes to implement aforesaid decision of the Board w.e.f 15.01.2024.

5. Learned counsels for the petitioners submit that, at this stage, they do not press their petitions, however, they may be granted liberty to assail any condition of the policy which is contrary to statutory or other applicable provisions.

6. In the wake of statements of both sides, the present petitions stand disposed of with aforesaid liberty to the petitioners.

( JAGMOHAN BANSAL )

JUDGE

11.12.2023

Ali

|                           |               |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No        |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |