



107

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

**CWP-20342-2025
DECIDED ON: 10.09.2025**

AKHIL**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: None

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to consider one family member of the deceased employee for compassionate appointment who died in harness on 26.10.2017, while in service should have retrospective effect as per the policy framed under Article 309 of the Constitution of India along with consequential benefits in view of law laid down by this Hon'ble High Court in various judgments as well as by the Hon'ble Apex Court.
2. Although a request was made in the morning to take up the matter through hybrid mode but no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner, despite the virtual window being kept open.
3. In the instant petition, the petitioner is claiming compassionate appointment on account of death of his father on 26.10.2017. It is averred that the

deceased was working on the post of Progress Assistant and was lastly posted at Rewari.

4. This petition came up for hearing on 06.08.2025, however, the petitioner was not available for assisting the Court and similar was the situation on 21.07.2025, wherein a request for adjournment was made by Mr. Tejpal Singh Dhull, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Neeraj Yadav. Today also, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner.

5. Perusal of the record shows that the father of the petitioner died on 26.10.2017 almost 8 years prior to the filing of instant petition and for the first time, a representation seems to have been moved on 03.01.2025, which is on record at Annexure P-1.

6. The above-said fact and the lapse of 8 years is sufficient enough to infer that no financial harness exist as on date and the claim made in the instant petition is highly belated. It is with the fact that the petitioner is un-represented consistently.

7. In the light of above, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition.

8. Accordingly, the same is dismissed for want of prosecution.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

10.09.2025
Meenu

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