



122

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

CWP-26718-2025

Date of decision: 09.09.2025

Pankaj

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Nishant Maini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 7.**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari* for quashing the order dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure P-6), whereby, the case of the petitioner for compassionate appointment on account of death of his father has been rejected by wrongly applying the Ex-Gratia Employment Rules, 2019 (Annexure P-7).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that father of the petitioner was working as a Shift Attendant at HPVNL, Panipat. He was appointed through outsourcing since 01.05.2013 and he died on 16.11.2024 while in service as discernible from his death certificate (Annexure P-1). Thereafter, an application for compassionate appointment for the petitioner was subsequently submitted under the deployment of the Contractual Persons Policy, 2022. Thereafter, the Executive Engineer sought legal advice and a committee was constituted which has wrongly relied upon the provisions of Ex-Gratia Employment Rules, 2019 which is not applicable in the case of the petitioner. The claim of the petitioner was required to be considered in light of applicable policy in the Deployment of Contractual Persons Policy, 2022 (Annexure P-8). Learned counsel refers to the relevant clauses in the policy

**CWP-26718-2025****-2-**

and submits that the policy carries a specific provision for compassionate deployment and contains no age based restrictions for the deceased employees. Further, the petitioner has obtained a response under the Right to Information Act (Annexure P-10) which indicates that the appointment was granted in other cases where the deceased employees were over 52 years of age. The petitioner is identically circumstanced, however, his claim has been wrongly rejected.

3. Mr. Sukhdeep Singh Parmar, Advocate puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 to 7 and could not controvert the fact that the case of the petitioner is required to be considered under the applicable policy under the Deployment of Contractual Persons Policy, 2022 and submits that the case of the petitioner would be considered again and fresh order would be passed.

4. In view of the discussion above, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to reconsider the case of the petitioner for compassionate appointment strictly in accordance with the Deployment of Contractual Persons Policy, 2022 (Annexure P-8) and to pass a speaking order within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found eligible, necessary consequential benefits shall also be extended to him in accordance with law.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

09.09.2025*Neha*

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