



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

LPA No.417 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 28.04.2025

Sunita Kumari

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present:- Ms. Monika Khatri, Advocate for
Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Vishal Singh Chauhan, Advocate for
Mr. Gagandeep Singh Wasu, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 5.

Mr. M.M. Pandey, Advocate and
Mr. Umesh Pandey, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

CM No.865-LPA of 2017

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed and the delay of 22 days in filing the instant appeal is condoned.

LPA No.417 of 2017

1. The appellant assails the order dated 24.01.2017 passed by
learned Single Judge, whereby learned Single Judge has dismissed the writ-
petition preferred by the appellant/writ-petitioner.



2. The appellant submits that while her real brother was offered job on account of the acquisition of 02 acres of land belonging to her father, and another son of her father's brother was also offered job for 02 acres of land belonging to her father's brother, and so far as 02 acres of land acquired of her grandfather is concerned, she should have been offered the job as she was a graduate and the same has wrongly been given to the son of her father's brother who was merely matriculate. As per the policy, one member of the family, whose land has been acquired, would be entitled for consideration of appointment and the family as such would be sons, grandsons, grand-daughters, maternal grandson, wife, daughter-in-law, nephews etc. So far as the land acquired of the grandfather is concerned, the right for consideration for job would accrue not only to the petitioner but to other grandsons as well as sons and grand-daughters and grandsons (maternal) also. If one of them has been selected and appointed, i.e respondent No.6, another person cannot claim the said post.

3. We find that learned Single Judge has also noticed the said aspect which does not warrant any further intervention by us in LPA. The present LPA is, accordingly, dismissed.

4. All the pending miscellaneous application(s) also stand disposed of.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

28.04.2025
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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