



LPA-1066-2026 (O&M)

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

**LPA-1066-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 27.04.2026**

AMARJEET KAUR

...Appellant

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR**

Present: Mr. Surinder Gandhi, Advocate for the appellant.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (Oral)

CM-2625-LPA-2026

1. Present application has been filed for condoning the delay of 291 days in filing the appeal.
2. Keeping in view the contents mentioned in the application, the same is allowed.
3. Delay of 291 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

LPA-1066-2026

4. In the present appeal, the claim of the appellant is that a sum of Rs.15 lakhs granted to the appellant in CWP-4430-2020 is less and therefore, the same should be enhanced.
5. At the outset, learned counsel for the appellant was requested to show, how, the grant of the said benefit by the learned Single Judge was not adequate and on what ground, the enhancement is being sought. However, learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to show any pleading that on what account, the enhancement is being sought of the

**LPA-1066-2026 (O&M)**

amount of compensation granted by the learned Single Judge. The learned counsel only submits that the same is not adequate. Learned counsel submits that the grant of the compensation to the tune of Rs.15 lakhs is inadequate, as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Rohtash Kumar Vs. State of Haryana, 2013 (14) SCC 290***, wherein, a sum of Rs.20 lakhs was awarded, whereas, after a period of more than one decade, a sum of Rs.15 lakhs has been awarded by the Court. It is further argued that no reason has been forthcoming as to why the matter cannot first be referred to the CBI for registration of an FIR and thereafter for investigation.

6. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and have gone through the case file with his able assistance.

7. It may be noticed that the learned Single Judge has already granted a compensation of Rs.15 lakhs to the appellant. The said compensation in case is inadequate, reasons must be mentioned as to on what basis the same deserves to be enhanced to Rs.1 crore. Not even a single reason for enhancement except, that the compensation awarded is inadequate has been mentioned in the grounds of appeal. In the absence of any specific reason justifying enhancement, the mere perception of the appellant that the compensation is inadequate cannot be a ground for enhancement by this Court in appeal. It may be noticed that compensation is to be determined on the facts and circumstances of each case and not with reference to the date of the judgment. Nothing has been shown to this Court as to on what basis the compensation awarded by the learned Single Judge was inadequate or why the same needs to be



LPA-1066-2026 (O&M)

enhanced. In the absence of any such averment, the compensation awarded by the learned Single Judge cannot be enhanced. Learned Single Judge has already granted the liberty to the appellant to avail appropriate remedies with regard to the criminal proceedings. Merely because the appellant seeks a CBI inquiry, despite the learned Single Judge not finding it to be a fit case for such transfer of the case to CBI, assertion of appellant alone cannot be a ground to refer the matter to the CBI.

- 8. Accordingly, the present appeal is dismissed.
- 9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

27.04.2026
Amandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No