



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

142

CWP-15241-2025

Decided On: 26.05.2025

REENA GOYAL AND OTHERS

....PETITIONER(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENT(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ranjan Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J.(Oral)

The petition has been filed, *inter alia*, seeking a writ of *certiorari* quashing the judgment, dated 14.11.2024, passed by the Educational Tribunal, Rohtak, whereby the petitioner's appeal seeking leave encashment and compassionate financial assistance for the deceased/husband of petitioner no.1, who worked as Professor in the respondent/College run by Vaish Education Society.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to point out any illegality or error of law in the impugned judgment, a perusal whereof shows it has been passed on relevant facts by taking into consideration the provisions of law. A reference can be made to the following findings recorded by the Tribunal:

Though the Statutes framed by the Pune University under the 1974 Act entitle the teachers of the affiliated colleges to get the benefit of leave encashment, there is no provision either in that Act or in the 1994 Act which obligates the State Government to extend the benefit of leave encashment to the university teachers or to the teachers of the affiliated colleges and the mere fact that the Statutes of the particular university provide for grant



of leave encashment to the teachers, does not entitle the concerned university or college to claim reimbursement from the State Government as of right.

12. Similarly, the appellants' claim for compassionate assistance is concerned, lack legal foundation, as no provision exists under which compassionate appointment can be provided to the dependent of the deceased employee of unaided school or college. Compassionate appointments are not a general entitlement but are contingent upon specific schemes or rules that govern them. Therefore, without an established frame work supporting their claim, it is evident that the appellants are not eligible for compassionate appointment based on the circumstances outlined above. No doubt, such appointments are intended to assist families facing financial hardships due to the loss of the primary earner, but eligibility is strictly defined and limited to certain conditions.

3. In view thereof, there is no ground to entertain the present petition and it stands dismissed *in limine*.

26.05.2025
Ad

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No