

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

126

CWP-13508-2026

Date of Decision: 04.05.2026

Vijay Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Gourav Rana, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Deepak Vashisth, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

Mr. Akshay Kumar Dahiya, Advocate

for Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate for respondent No.3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of orders dated 04.09.2025 (Annexure P-7) and 30.01.2026 (Annexure P-10) whereby respondents have rejected his claim for financial assistance.

2. The petitioner claims that he, on account of death of her mother, filed claim for financial assistant under Mukhyamantri Kisan Evam Khetihar Majdoor Jiwan Suraksha Yojna, 2013 (for short '**2013 Yojna**'). As per said Scheme, if any farmer or worker/mazdoor dies, his family is entitled to financial assistance to the tune of ₹5,00,000/-. The petitioner's mother passed away in her field due to snake bite. He applied for financial assistance under aforesaid Scheme. The application was rejected by respondent No.3-Secretary-cum-Executive, Market Committee, Kunjpura,

District Karnal. He filed appeal which was allowed by way of remand. Respondent No.3 by impugned order dated 30.01.2026 has again rejected his claim on the ground that his mother did not die due to snake bite while working in the field whereas she died while doing household chores.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent has mechanically rejected his claim. There are statements to the effect that his mother passed away due to snake bite in the field. She did not die due to snake bite at home.

4. From the perusal of impugned order, it is evident that respondents twice i.e. 25.08.2025 and 08.01.2026 conducted inquiry from villagers. On the basis of inquiry, an opinion was formed that deceased died due to snake bite at home. She, at the time of incident, was not in the agriculture field. The petitioner is claiming otherwise. 2013 Yojna is a beneficial Scheme and it should be interpreted liberally. The procedural infirmities may be ignored if there is substantive compliance. Once it is established that claimant falls within four corners of the Scheme, the procedural formalities may be ignored. In the present case, the Authorities have twice conducted inquiry and thereafter concluded that incident took place at home and the petitioner is trying to take advantage by misrepresenting the facts. There is no reason to disbelieve inquiry conducted by Authorities. In any case, it becomes disputed question of fact and this Court while exercising powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot adjudicate disputed questions of fact.

5. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

04.05.2026
Mohit Kumar

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