



CWP-25646-2025

-1-

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

142

CWP-25646-2025

Date of Decision:01.09.2025

SUNITA DEVI

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Lather, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Vashisth, DAG, Haryana.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

1. Instant writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India *inter alia* for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing impugned rejection order dated 26.03.2024, Annexure P-5, passed by respondent No.2.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the widow of Sh. Shamsher Singh, who expired on 24.06.2023 due to natural causes. He states that petitioner fulfills the eligibility conditions under the Scheme “Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Antyodaya Parivar Suraksha Yojana (DAYALU)” dated 24.05.2023, Annexure P-1, and submitted an application for grant of financial assistance. He asserts that without assigning any reason, application has been rejected vide the impugned order, which is cryptic in nature.

3. Advance copy of the petition has been served upon the



CWP-25646-2025

-2-

respondents.

4. Issue notice of motion to respondent No.1.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Deepak Vashisth, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice, on behalf of respondent No.1.

6. Noticing the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court does not deem it necessary to call upon the said respondent to file a response. From the documents appended with the petition, it is apparent that petitioner had applied under the scheme, Annexure P-1, however, the application has been rejected by passing a one word order “REJECTED”. Such type of rejection orders at the hands of respondents-authorities are not appreciated. In **Kranti Associates Pvt. Ltd. and another Versus Masood Ahmed Khan and others (2010) 9 SCC 496**, Hon’ble Supreme Court has held that reasons are indispensable component of decision making process and an order effecting the rights of the parties has to be self speaking. It was observed that a judicial/quasi-judicial authority must record reasons in support of its conclusion as it operates as a valid restraint on any possible arbitrary exercise of power.

7. Without observing anything more, impugned order, Annexure P-5, is set aside. Respondent No.2 is directed to pass a fresh order assigning reasons in support of its conclusion. Needful be done within a period of three months from the date of communication of the order.

8. Writ petition is disposed of.

01.09.2025

sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No