



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

CWP-26586-2017
Date of decision: 17.09.2025

Shaganpreet Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Civil Supplies Corporation
Ltd. & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Anamika Sheoran, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Verma, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground as per qualification of the petitioner as his father had died while in service.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that father of the petitioner was initially working as a Watchman in the respondent-Corporation on daily wages. He was retrenched on 17.11.1987. Subsequently, he was taken back in service on 15.07.2002 as discernible from Annexure P-1 and his appointment letter (Annexure P-2). The father of the petitioner died on 13.08.2015 and at the time of the death of his father, his case for regularization of his service was under active consideration. However, he unfortunately died



before his service could be regularized. On 17.09.2015, the mother of the petitioner submitted her affidavit seeking appointment on compassionate ground. The petitioner completed his B.Tech. in the year 2017 and he has been approaching the respondents for being appointed on compassionate ground, however, no action has been taken thereon. Thereafter, a representation dated 05.04.2017 (Annexure P-6) has been sent to the respondent-Corporation through his counsel which remained unheeded and the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court in Allahabad High Court titled as '**State of U.P. through Prin.Secy, Agriculture and 3 others Vs. Kuldeep Thakur**' 2013 (3) All LJ 97 and submits that the controversy involved in the present case is squarely covered by the judgment of the Division Bench. The petitioner therein was ordered to be appointed on compassionate ground after taking into consideration the fact that the case of the deceased father of the petitioner for regularization was under process and he had unfortunately died before he could be regularized. As such, the case of the petitioner is even covered on facts by the aforementioned judgment of the Division Bench in **Kuldeep Thakur's case (supra)**. He further submits that it is not in dispute that upon regularization, the petitioner would be entitled to a compassionate appointment in terms of the policy of the Government of Punjab adopted by the respondent-Corporation. The process for granting benefits of regularization has already commenced but before the decision could be taken, in the interregnum period, father of the petitioner, expired.

4. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation submits



that in compliance of the order passed by this Court on 07.08.2025, additional affidavit has already been filed by Vineet Kumar District Manager, PUNSUP in the Registry of this Court and the same is taken on record. Registry to do the needful. This Court has directed to file a specific affidavit deliberating therein as to when the case of the father of the petitioner was forwarded for regularization and whether, father of the petitioner was eligible for regularization.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation refers to the affidavit and submits that the contentions raised by the petitioner with regard to the regularization of the petitioner's father under active consideration is factually incorrect. In fact as per the record of the respondent-Corporation, the case of father of the petitioner, namely, Malkiat Singh has never been sent for regularization by the respondent-Corporation to any authority. Further, at the time of his death, his case was not under consideration for regularization of his service. Further, learned counsel for the respondent-Corporation submits that there is no provision in the policy or the statutory rules providing for the compassionate appointment to the dependent of a deceased employee who is working on a daily wages.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record of the case, it transpires that the deceased father of the petitioner was working on daily wages with the respondent-Corporation and he was not holding any substantive or temporary post against a regular vacancy, as such, the recruitment of the dependent of the deceased employee, working on daily wages, cannot be made on the ground of compassionate appointment.



CWP-26586-2017

-4-

7. In view of the discussion above, the present civil writ petition is hereby dismissed.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

Neha

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