



CWP-2794-2025 1

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

(112) CWP-2794-2025
Date of Decision : February 03, 2025

Meena Jamwal .. Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others .. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI

Present: Mr. Dinesh Mahajan, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI J. (ORAL)

1. Present writ petition has been filed challenging the order dated 10.01.2022/02.11.2022 (Annexure P-6) as well as the order dated 26.10.2023 (Annexure P-8) by which, the respondents have declined to accept the prayer of the petitioner for the grant of appointment as class IV employee being the Dam oustee.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that once, the land of the father of the petitioner was acquired for the purpose of the Ranjit Singh Dam Project and as per the policy of the State of Punjab for rehabilitation and re-settlement, one member of the oustee family was made entitled for the appointment and as in the present case, no appointment has been given qua the land acquired belonging to the father of the petitioner, the petitioner

**CWP-2794-2025****2**

was entitled for the grant of benefit of appointment, which benefit has wrongly been denied.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the rejection of the claim by the respondents is arbitrary and illegal.

4. Keeping in view the service of advance copy of petition, Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, learned Sr. Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, appears and submits that father of the petitioner namely Sh. Porakh was offered appointment but he declined to accept the same and stated that his son Sumit Jamwal should be given appointment, which request was considered and Sumit Jamwal was given appointment as class IV employee in the year 2013 vide appointment letter dated 30.07.2013 (Annexure P-2) but he failed to join and now the claim regarding appointment is being made by sister namely Meena Jamwal (petitioner) of Sumit Jamwal, who is the daughter of Sh. Porakh, which cannot be accepted at this stage.

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

6. The grant of the job to the Dam oustee is a concession which was extended to them. The land of the father of the petitioner which was acquired, the compensation for the same was paid and so as to rehabilitate the Dam oustee, the appointment was offered to the father of the petitioner which was subsequently, on the request of father of the petitioner, was offered to the brother of the petitioner in the year 2013. The appointment letter dated 30.07.2013 (Annexure P-2) was also issued but the brother of the petitioner failed to join and thereafter, the sister is claiming appointment, which is not permissible.

**CWP-2794-2025****3**

7. The petitioner cannot claim the appointment especially when the appointment had already been offered to the brother of the petitioner who did not join the same. The claim regarding the appointment of a family member of Dam oustee stands extinguished on the issue of the appointment letter in the favour of brother of the petitioner. Merely that the brother did not join, will not keep the said right alive qua the petitioner so as to claim appointment.

8. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

February 03, 2025*harsha***(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No