



-1-

133

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

**CWP-26851-2025
Date of decision:-10.09.2025**

Manjeet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and anr.

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present : Mr. Rohit Kumar, Advocate and
Ms. Yashika Walia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. A.G., 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, Annexure P-4, passed by respondent No.2.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is the widow of Sh. Shiv Kumar, who expired on 02.06.2024. He states that petitioner fulfills the eligibility conditions under the Scheme "Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Antyodaya Parivar Suraksha Yojana (DAYALU)"



-2-

133

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 respondents.

4. Issue notice of motion to respondents.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana, accepts notice, on behalf of respondents. Noticing the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court does not deem it necessary to call upon the respondents to file a response.

6. 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.



-3-

133

7. Without observing anything more, impugned order, Annexure P-4, 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.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

10.09.2025
Brij

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