

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

107

CWP-15160-2026

DATE OF DECISION: 15.05.2026

AMANDEEP GILL**... Petitioner****Versus****UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS****... Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA**

Present: Ms. Rakhi Sharma, Legal Aid Counsel
for the petitioner.

HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed challenging the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal Chandigarh Bench (for short – the ‘Tribunal’) by which the claim for grant of compassionate appointment being sought by the petitioner has been declined on the ground that the petitioner has not been able to prove that he is the son of the deceased-employee namely, David Gill.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though civil proceedings were initiated for declaration that the petitioner is the son of David Gill but such proceedings have culminated whereby a finding has been recorded that the petitioner was the grandson of the wife of David Gill keeping in view her previous marriage which she had performed prior to her marriage with David Gill. Learned counsel further submits that even once in the Regular Second Appeal filed, liberty was given to approach the competent authority for redressal of their grievance for which the petitioner had approached the Tribunal and therefore, it was the duty of the Tribunal to again look into the aspect that whether the petitioner is the son of David Gill or not rather than placing reliance upon the findings recorded by the Civil Court.



3. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with her able assistance.

4. It is very unfortunate that such claims are being raised by manipulating the facts after the death of a civil servant. The learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to rebut the fact that the relationship of the petitioner with David Gill is disputed. Not only this, in an effort to get himself declared as a son of David Gill, the so called mother i.e., wife of David Gill namely Gian Kaur started proceedings for declaration by filing a civil suit wherein, it transpired and a finding has been recorded that the petitioner is actually the son of Jarnail Singh, who is the son of Gian Kaur from a previous marriage with the one Mal Singh meaning thereby that petitioner is the grandson of Gian Kaur.

5. The said findings have not been rebutted by the learned counsel for the petitioner even during the course of hearing. Once, there is no relationship of petitioner with David Gill, who is the deceased-employee and even after the marriage of Gian Kaur with David Gill, the relationship is not that of a son between the petitioner and David Gill, seeking compassionate appointment even in such facts and circumstances by projecting himself to be the son of David Gill cannot be accepted. *Prima facie*, the claim is a fraudulent one, based upon the incorrect facts which are being projected before the authorities despite a finding by the Civil Court against the petitioner, so as to attain undue benefit.

6. No ground is made out by this Court for any interference.

7. The present petition stands dismissed.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

15.05.2026
sapna adhikari

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No