



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

111

CWP-7641-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 13.03.2026

Pallvi @ Pallvi Tomar

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Ms. Bhavya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents to consider and decide the claim of the petitioner, namely Ms. Pallavi Tomar, for appointment on compassionate grounds in place of her deceased husband, in accordance with the applicable rules, policies and settled law, within a time bound period. Further prayer has been made to decide the representation dated 22.12.2025 (Annexure P-8) filed by the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner's husband late Nishant Tomar, who was serving as Manager with the respondent/Bank at Barsat Road Branch, Panipat, had died in harness on 23.05.2025 as is evident from the Death Certificate (Annexure P-1). She further submits that the sudden demise of the husband of the petitioner left the petitioner, being his widow and



dependent family member, in severe financial hardship. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that after the demise of the petitioner's husband, instead of extending support to the bereaved family, the respondent/Bank issued recovery notices dated 30.09.2025 (Annexure P-2) in respect of the Staff Clean Overdraft Account and Car Loan Account of the deceased employee. She further contends that the respondent/Bank, thereafter, issued a legal notice dated 06.10.2025 demanding repayment of the alleged loan amount from the petitioner and the mother-in-law of the petitioner. In response thereto, the petitioner submitted a detailed reply dated 09.10.2025 (Annexure P-4) to the Branch Manager of respondent/Bank informing the Bank about the demise of her husband and clarifying her legal position as a legal heir. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that despite the Bank having been duly informed about the death of its employee, the respondent/Bank continued to issue further communications and notices dated 21.10.2025 (Annexure P-5) mechanically in the name of the deceased employee. The petitioner, thereafter, issued a legal notice dated 20.11.2025 (Annexure P-6) calling upon the respondents to consider her claim for appointment on compassionate grounds in accordance with the applicable policy of the Bank. In response thereto, the respondent/Bank vide communication dated 19.12.2025 (Annexure P-7) directed the petitioner to approach the Regional Office and submit a formal application along with relevant documents. In compliance with the said directions, the petitioner submitted a formal representation



dated 22.12.2025 (Annexure P-8) requesting compassionate appointment under the applicable scheme. However, despite the lapse of considerable time, the respondents have failed to take any decision on the representation submitted by the petitioner. The petitioner was therefore constrained to issue another legal notice dated 21.01.2026 (Annexure P-9) requesting the respondents to decide her claim for compassionate appointment within a reasonable period. In the meantime, instead of deciding the representation of the petitioner, the respondent/Bank initiated recovery proceedings and filed a Commercial Suit bearing No.CS-18-2026 before the Court of Civil Judge (Junior Division), Panipat against the petitioner and respondent No.4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner, on one hand is not being provided the compassionate appointment, despite submitting her application and on the other hand, the recovery proceedings have been initiated against her and hence, the petitioner on the verge of destitution has been left with no other efficacious remedy except to approach this Court.

2.1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that she would be satisfied if the representation dated 22.12.2025 (Annexure P-8) as well as legal notice dated 21.01.2026 (Annexure P-9) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.3 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record of the case with her able assistance, the present



petition is being decided *in limine* without issuing notice to the respondents in order to save judicial time of the Court and also the litigation costs of the respondent.

4. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, the respondent No.3 is directed to consider the representation dated 22.12.2025 (Annexure P-8) as well as legal notice dated 21.01.2026 (Annexure P-9) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.3.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

6. It is made clear that any deviation from the directions issued by this Court, would entitle the petitioner to move an appropriate application under Article 215 of the Constitution of India seeking initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

13.03.2026
yakub

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