



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

114

CWP-6579-2026

Date of Decision: 11.05.2026

MANJEET KAUR

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Rohit K. Arora, Advocate and
Ms. Yashika Walia, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-10) whereby respondent has rejected her claim on the ground of discrepancy in the age of the deceased recorded in two different documents.

2. This is second round of litigation. On the earlier occasion, the petitioner preferred *CWP-26851-2025* which was disposed of with a direction to respondents to decide petitioner's claim within 3 months from the date of communication of the order. The respondent by impugned order dated 02.02.2026 has rejected petitioner's claim on the ground that age of deceased as per Family ID was 41 years and 3 months whereas in the Death Certificate it is recorded as 38 years.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that age of deceased either considered 38 years or 41 years would be irrelevant because financial assistance of Rs.5,00,000/- under "*Deen Dayal Upadhaya Antyodaya*



Parivar Suraksha Yojana (DAYALU)” is available where age of the deceased is between 25 years to 45 years. The deceased concededly had crossed minimum age and was below maximum age either his age is considered 41 years or 38 years.

4. Learned State counsel submits that petitioner may be asked to get deceased’s Death Certificate or Family ID corrected qua age.

5. This is second round of litigation and petitioner in the age of 35 years has lost her husband. It would be travesty of justice if she is asked to move from one department to another department for financial assistance payable under the aforesaid welfare Scheme. DAYALU is a piece of beneficial legislation and its benefit should not be denied on procedural or technical grounds. Had deceased, as per any document, been below 25 years or more than 45 years the position could be different, however, concededly deceased was more than 25 years and less than 45 years. Asking the petitioner to get her husband’s age corrected in official documents would add to her injuries and wounds.

6. In the backdrop, this Court finds it appropriate to direct the respondent to release claimed financial assistance to the petitioner as per *Deen Dayal Upadhaya Antyodaya Parivar Suraksha Yojana*. Let the needful be done within 4 weeks from today.

7. Disposed of in above terms.

8. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

11.05.2026
SDK

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