

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

|                             |                                                        |                |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| (249)                       | CWP-17377-2022<br>Date of Decision : February 06, 2024 |                |
| Chetram and others          |                                                        | .. Petitioners |
|                             | Versus                                                 |                |
| State of Haryana and others |                                                        | .. Respondents |
| (2)                         | CWP-17689-2022                                         |                |
| Bhoop Singh and others      |                                                        | .. Petitioners |
|                             | Versus                                                 |                |
| State of Haryana and others |                                                        | .. Respondents |
| (3)                         | CWP-19691-2022                                         |                |
| Anoop Singh and another     |                                                        | .. Petitioners |
|                             | Versus                                                 |                |
| State of Haryana and others |                                                        | .. Respondents |
| (4)                         | CWP-20553-2022                                         |                |
| Anoop Singh and others      |                                                        | .. Petitioners |
|                             | Versus                                                 |                |
| State of Haryana and others |                                                        | .. Respondents |
| (5)                         | CWP-20914-2022                                         |                |
| Satish Kumar                |                                                        | .. Petitioner  |
|                             | Versus                                                 |                |
| State of Haryana and others |                                                        | .. Respondents |

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI**

Present: Mr. Tarun Kumar, Advocate, for  
Mr. Keshav Pratap Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners  
in CWP Nos.17377 and 20914 of 2022.

Mr. Ajay Vijarania, Advocate, for the petitioners  
in CWP Nos.17689 and 20553 of 2022.

Mr. Sanjay Ghalawat, Advocate, for the petitioners  
in CWP No.19691 of 2022.

Mr. Pankaj Middha, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana.

Ms. Sonia Madan, Advocate, for respondent No.3  
in CWP No.17689 of 2022.

Mr. Umesh Aggarwal, Advocate for  
respondent-Jhajjar Thermal Power Plant Limited.

**HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)**

1. By this common order, five writ petitions, the details of which have been given in the heading, are being disposed of as all the petitions involve the same question of law on similar facts.

2. In the present writ petitions, the grievance being raised by the petitioners is that the acquired land which belongs to the petitioners is for the purpose of setting up of Thermal Plant and keeping in view the announcement made by the Chief Minister, one family member of the land owner is entitled for employment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that keeping in view the policy which has been issued by the respondents on 09.11.2010, the petitioners are entitled for the benefit under the said policy qua the grant of employment to the one of the family member.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that prima facie, keeping in view the reply filed by the respondent- Jhajjar Thermal Power Plant Limited, which authority is utilizing the land, there is no right with the

petitioners to claim appointment from the said Thermal Plant and even the policy under which the benefit is claimed, is not applicable upon the petitioners.

5. Learned State counsel concedes the factum that the land of the petitioners has been acquired and also concedes the factum of the issuance of policy dated 09.11.2010 but submits that the petitioners are not entitled for the benefit under the said policy.

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

7. The claim of the petitioners is for the grant of employment keeping in view the fact that the land belonging to the petitioners has been acquired. The reliance is being placed upon the policy dated 09.11.2010. Nothing has come on record that the claim of the petitioners has been considered as to whether, they are entitled for the employment or not. Nothing has come on record that the respondents have considered the claim of the petitioners under the policy dated 09.11.2010 so as to point out whether any benefit under the said policy is admissible or not or that policy dated 09.11.2010 is not applicable qua the petitioners.

8. Keeping in view the fact that the claim of the petitioners has not been adverted to by the respondents so far, the present petitions are being disposed of with a direction to the respondent-State as well as the concerned authorities to consider the claim of the petitioners as raised in the present petitions for the grant of employment under the policy dated 09.11.2010. In case, the claim of the petitioners is covered under the said policy, appropriate relief be given but in case, the same is not covered, due to any reasons same be mentioned for the information and necessary action of the petitioners by passing a speaking order.

9. Let the said speaking order be passed by the respondent-State/concerned authorities within a period of eight weeks of the receipt of copy of this order.

10. The present writ petitions are disposed of in above terms.

11. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected cases.

**February 06, 2024**  
*harsha*

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No