



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(249)

CWP No. 13374 of 2021(O&M)
Date of Decision : 03.09.2024

Ramandeep

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Baljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satnam Preet Singh, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)

1. In the present petition, the grievance being raised by the petitioner is that his family was sufferer at the hands of Terrorists and his uncle was killed in Terrorist attack and as per the Instructions, which were issued by the State, one member of the Terrorist affected family, has been granted the compassionate appointment.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that keeping in view the list of the candidates appointed under the said Instructions on compassionate ground, copy of which has been appended as Annexure P-7, the petitioner is also entitled for the grant of compassionate appointment and the same is not being considered only on the ground that after the year 2013, no such benefit has been extended to any despite being eligible under the Instructions.
3. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioner is claiming appointment on the basis of an incident, which occurred in the year 1992 and the State has already decided that after the year 2013, no benefit will



be given for appointment to under the Instructions relating to the compassionate appointment to the Terrorist affected families.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

5. Once, upto the year 2013, the benefit was given to the members of the Terrorist affect families and the Instructions dated 21.11.2002 (Annexure R-1) have not been withdrawn so far, the respondents are under obligation to grant the petitioner the consideration for appointment on compassionate ground under the said Instructions dated 21.11.2002 (Annexure R-1).

6. The non consideration of the claim of the petitioner at the outset is totally arbitrary and illegal. No reason is coming forward with regard to eligibility of the petitioner to seek the benefit under the Instructions dated 21.11.2002, copy of which has been appended as Annexure R-1, hence, respondents are directed to give appropriate consideration to the claim of the petitioner with regard to his claim for compassionate appointment under the Instructions dated 21.11.2002 (Annexure R-1). Let the said consideration be completed within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of copy of this order and in case, the petitioner is found eligible, appropriate benefit be given, otherwise due reasons be mentioned for not accepting the claim of the petitioner.

7. Present petition is disposed of in above terms.

September 03, 2024
kanchan

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No