



101+102

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

RA-LP-44-2026 (O&M) in LPA-1863-2019

Date of Decision: 22nd May, 2026.

HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD. AND OTHERS
.....Appellant(s)

V/s

SANDEEP KUMAR AND ANOTHER *.....Respondent(s)*

RA-LP-43-2026 (O&M) in LPA-1862-2019

HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LTD. AND OTHERS
.....Appellant(s)

V/s

SANDEEP KUMAR AND ANOTHER *.....Respondent(s)*

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARMOD GOYAL

Present Mr. Zorwar Singh Chauhan, Advocate,
 for the applicant(s)-respondent(s) No.1.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. These review applications are filed by respondent No.1 seeking review of composite order dated 10.04.2026 passed by this Court in LPA Nos. 1862 & 1863 of 2019.

2. The claim of review-applicant/respondent No.1 for compassionate appointment in 'the land oustees category' has already been rejected by this Court vide judgment dated 10.04.2026. The present application has now been filed for review of the said order stating that the term 'family' occurring in the Guidelines/Policy dated 05.07.2007 would include the co-sharers as well and therefore, the land holding of the review

applicant/respondent No.1 ought to be treated to be more than two acres which was required for the entitled compassionate appointment.

3. The term 'family' has been defined as under:-

“Family would mean as it stood on the date the land was acquired and not further sub-divisions and subsequent families created on the basis of partition.”

4. It is not an issue here that the land in question was acquired in the year 1998. The revenue records would reveal that at the time of acquisition of land, the father of the review applicant/respondent No.1 was independently recorded as a 'co-sharer' along with other co-sharers, who were the descendants of the common ancestors. The land acquired of the review applicant/respondent No.1's father was less than two acres. Learned counsel for the review applicant/respondent No.1, therefore, submits that definition of 'family' ought to include all other co-sharers as well, since they were descendants of the common ancestors.

5. This plea of the learned counsel for the review-applicant/respondent No.1, cannot be accepted inasmuch as the 'family' would consist of all members of the co-sharers recorded at the time of acquisition of the land. It will be the father of review-applicant/respondent No.1, along with other members of his family including wife and children etc. Any further sub-division of the land of co-sharers would not be admissible. However, the land holding of the father of review applicant/respondent No.1 cannot be clubbed with other co-sharers, since all such co-sharers constituted separate families. Even the affidavit/consent

letter, which forms the basis of the claim of the review applicant/respondent No.1, is of his father namely Satbir Singh and his family does not include other co-sharers.

6. In such circumstances, we find no good ground to review our order(s) dated 10.04.2026 passed in LPAs No. 1862 & 1863 of 2019. Consequently, the Review Applications fail and are ***dismissed***.

7. Pending application(s), if any, in these cases are disposed of accordingly.

[ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA]
JUDGE

[PARMOD GOYAL]
JUDGE

May 22, 2026
Ess Kay

<i>Whether speaking / reasoned</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	:	<i>Yes</i>	/	<i>No</i>