



CWP-21366-2023

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

212

CWP-21366-2023

Date of Decision:28.11.2025

VANDNA

...Petitioner

Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Surinder Singh, Advocate with
Ms. Baljit Kaur, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S. Bajwa, Advocate
for respondent No.2-Bank (through video conferencing).

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the impugned order dated 21.01.2023 (Annexure P-6) passed by respondent No.3 and further seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for grant of compassionate appointment, the petitioner being a dependent of the deceased employee.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the eligibility criteria set out in the Compassionate Appointment Scheme (Annexure P-3) was applicable at the time of the death of the petitioner's father on 03.01.2021. He further submits that the petitioner applied immediately thereafter



3. The claim of the petitioner was rejected without following the procedure prescribed under Clause 12(c) of the Scheme (Annexure P-3). The claim of the petitioner was rejected in a mechanical manner by passing a cryptic two-line order, relying upon Circular No.07/2019 dated 18.02.2019 and 81/2021 dated 24.09.2021. It is settled law that the claim of the petitioner for compassionate appointment was required to be considered in the light of the policy in force at the time of the death of the father, as laid down by the Full Bench in ***Krishna Kumari v. State Of Haryana & Others 2012 (2) SCT 736***.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that the financial aspect of the family of the deceased as a whole was considered in the light of Circular No.81/2021 circulated by letter dated 24.09.2021. However, he could not controvert the fact that the impugned order does not indicate any grounds for rejection of the claim made by the petitioner.

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

6. A bare perusal of the record indicates that the claim of the petitioner has been rejected by passing a cryptic two-line order and learned counsel for respondent-Bank is not in a position to controvert that the procedure prescribed under Clause 12(c) of the Scheme has not been followed.

7. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of at this stage by setting aside the impugned order dated 21.01.2023 (Annexure P-6). The respondent-Bank is directed to consider the claim of the petitioner and decide the same strictly in terms of the policy in force at the time of the death of the father of the petitioner, in light of the judgement rendered by the Full Bench of this Court in ***Krishna's case (supra)***. The respondent-Bank shall grant an

opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner and pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
P.Bhatt

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