



CWP-35596-2025 (O&M)

-1-

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

114

CWP-35596-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

Jagseer Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: - Mr. Dheeraj Narula, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Vikas Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Saurabh Singla, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 6

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 23.07.2025 (Annexure P-5) whereby Market Committee, Malout has rejected his claim for financial assistance on the ground of delay.

2. The petitioner claims that his brother died on 10.09.2024 while working in his field due to electric shock/current. The aforesaid unfortunate incident was recorded on 19.09.2024 in Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib. The post-mortem was conducted on 19.09.2024 at Shri Guru Gobind Singh Medical College and Hospital, Faridkot. The petitioner on 19.06.2025 submitted application seeking financial assistance under Rehabilitation and Monetary Compensation Policy for Agricultural Accident Victims. The respondent has rejected his claim on the sole ground of delay.

The respondent has held that application seeking financial assistance could



be filed within 6 months from the date of incident whereas petitioner has filed application after more than 6 months.

3. Learned State counsel submits that in the post-mortem report dated 19.09.2024, it is recorded that deceased has fell down from transformer on 10.09.2024 at around 06:00 PM. The deceased may be working in the field, however, incident took place because of climbing on transformer.

4. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

5. From the perusal of impugned order, it is evident that respondent has rejected petitioner's claim on the sole ground of delay. As per applicable scheme, application could be filed within six months from the date of incident whereas application was filed after almost 9 months from the date of incident, meaning thereby, there was delay of 3 months. The respondent has not rejected petitioner's claim on merits, however, during the course of hearing pleaded that deceased was at fault or at least negligent, thus, petitioner is not entitled to compensation as per applicable policy. The aforesaid policy is a beneficial policy and its provisions cannot be strictly interpreted. It needs to be interpreted liberally. Delay of 3 months which cannot be called as exorbitant needs to be ignored and petitioner's claim deserves to be considered on merits.

6. In the backdrop, the impugned communication (Annexure P-5) is hereby set aside and respondents are directed to consider petitioner's claim as per aforesaid policy and documents available on record. Let the needful be done within 3 months from today.



- 7. Disposed of in above terms.
- 8. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

21.04.2026
Mohit Kumar

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