



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

RSA-1749-2008 (O&M)

SMT. SUSHMA DEVI

.....APPELLANT

VERSUS

PRITHIPAL AND ANOTHER

..... RESPONDENTS

Date of Reserve: 23.01.2026

Date of Pronouncement: 27.02.2026

Uploaded on:- 05.03.2026

Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced? No

Whether full judgment is pronounced? Yes

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Ms. Manveen Kahlon, Advocate (Through VC)
Mr. Karambir Singh Kahlon, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Rajinder Sharma, Advocate and
Mr. Mridul Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Animesh Sharma, Addl. A.G., Punjab,
for respondents No.2 and 3

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J.

1. The present appeal has been preferred against the judgment and decree dated 17.07.2007 passed by learned Additional District Judge (Adhoc), Amritsar, whereby appeal filed by respondent No.1 against judgment and decree dated 30.01.2004 passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Amritsar was allowed and he was held entitled to appointment on compassionate ground.



2. Brief facts of the case as per the civil suit are that respondent No.1 filed civil suit for declaration to the effect that he is adopted son of Ram Avadh (deceased), who was working as Chowkidar in the office of respondent No.2 and expired on 10.09.1997 while in service. He further asked for direction to respondent No.2 to appoint him as Chowkidar in the office of respondent No.2 in place of his father, Ram Avadh (deceased), who expired on 10.09.1997, according to registered Will executed by Ram Avadh (deceased) during his lifetime. Civil suit filed by respondent No.1 was dismissed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Amritsar, vide judgment and decree dated 30.01.2004. He filed appeal against the same, which was allowed by learned Additional District Judge (Adhoc), Amritsar, vide judgment and decree dated 17.07.2007. Hence, the present appeal.

3. Learned counsel for the State contends that judgment and decree dated 17.07.2007 is satisfied in execution filed by respondent No.1. On 23.05.2013, appointment letter was given to respondent No.1 and he joined on the same day.

4. Since respondent No.1 is working for the last 13 years and only one person from the family is to be granted compassionate appointment, therefore, the present Regular Second Appeal is **dismissed**.

5. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

27.02.2026

P.Seth

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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