



116

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

**CWP-34939-2025 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 28.11.2025**

MANJEET**.....PETITIONER(S)****VERSUS****STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENT(S)****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Parveen Moudgil, Advocate for the petitioner(s)

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This writ petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution seeks quashing of the order/reply dated 18.02.2020 (Annexure P-8), whereby the petitioner's claim for ex-gratia appointment under the Haryana Civil Services (Compassionate Financial Assistance or Appointment) Rules, 2019 was illegally and arbitrarily rejected. The petitioner further prays for a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to appoint him on compassionate grounds, as a mercy case, being the dependent son of late Sh. Balwant Singh, who died in harness, in terms of the 2019 Rules. In the alternative, if compassionate appointment is denied, he seeks a direction to grant lump-sum ex-gratia compensation with 18% interest as per instructions dated 16.03.2011 (P-4).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that claim of the petitioner suggests that the instant petition has been preferred in view of the legal notice (P-7) dated 10.11.2019 which has been rejected by way of reply to the legal notice

dated 18.02.2020 (Annexure P-8), a perusal of which would depict that prayer of the petitioner was primarily declined on account of the same being time barred.

3. The case of the petitioner is that his father died in harness on 22.10.1990, when the petitioner was only 6 years old. It is not disputed that an application for one-time financial assistance had been moved by the family, according to which Rs. 2.5 lakhs is to be provided to the dependents of deceased government employees but the application was kept pending and no action was taken by the competent authority. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the authorities through CM Window and a timely response was given but was rejected due to time bar as per Clause 4(i) of the Ex. Gratia Employment Rules, 2003.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon the judgment dated 13.11.2024 rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 8540–2024, '*Tinku vs. State of Haryana & Ors.*'

5. Without going into the technicalities of the case, the State Counsel would very clearly submits that Director General of Police, Haryana would look into the instant case as far as the alternate prayer for financial assistance is concerned.

6. In light of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the prayer for compassionate appointment is not being pressed and the petitioner confines his relief solely to the prayer for financial assistance.

7. Accordingly, respondent No. 2 – Director General of Police, Haryana, Panchkula, is directed to examine the case of the petitioner sympathetically, and take an appropriate decision regarding the grant of financial assistance strictly in accordance with law and in terms of Haryana Compassionate Assistance to the Dependence of Deceased Government Employee Rule, 2003 within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

8. A copy of the order so passed by the competent authority shall be supplied to the petitioner within one week thereafter.
9. The writ petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

28.11.2025
anuradha

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :Yes/No

Whether reportable :Yes/No