



CWP-3291-2019 (O&M)

-1-

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

CWP-3291-2019 (O&M)

PARAS

..Petitioner

Versus

CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA AND ORS.

..Respondents

Reserved on: 23.07.2026

Pronounced on : 04.08.2026

Uploaded on : 04.08.2026

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. Divya Arora, Advocate
for Mr. Aditya Grover, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Jindal, Advocate
for respondents.

* * * * *

SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J.

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to communication dated 25.01.2018 and 18.05.2018, whereby, the request of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate grounds is rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the claim for compassionate appointment of the petitioner is rejected on the ground that the petitioner does not fall in the category of indigent person. She, therefore, prays that the present writ petition be allowed.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondents contends that mother of the petitioner (wife of the deceased) was already working with the

Government and the income of the family is more than 60% of last drawn



salary of the deceased. He, therefore, prays that the present writ petition be dismissed.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the whole file of the case with their able assistance.

5. It would be apposite to reproduce written statement filed by the respondents, which is reproduced as under:-

“3. That the orders dated 25/01/2018 (Annexure P-6) and dated 18/05/2018 (Annexure P-7) issued by Respondent no. 3 and Respondent no. 2 respectively whereby the application of the petitioner for appointment on compassionate ground/payment of ex-gratia has been rightly declined as the competent authority has found that the financial condition of the family of late Sh. Hansraj (Deceased Staff) is not indigent in nature in view of Government/IBA guidelines and as per the provisions of the scheme. That it is worth mentioning here that the petitioner does not fit in the eligibility criteria in the Scheme of Compassionate Appointment on compassionate grounds or payment of lump sum ex-gratia amount and the related circulars. The mother of the petitioner is in the Govt. Service and is working as an assistant/steno in Skill Development & Industrial Training Department, Panchkula. Since the mother of the petitioner is in Govt. Service, she is also entitled to reimbursement of medical facility from her employer and the issue of medical expenses has not been reported by petitioner in the application for compassionate appointment.

4. That as per the provision of the scheme while considering a request for appointment on compassionate ground or payment of Ex-gratia a balanced and objective assessment of the financial condition of the family has to



be made taking into account its assets and liabilities and all the other relevant factors such as the presence of an earning member, size of the family etc. A copy of the circular regarding the Scheme for Payment of Ex-Gratia Lump Sum Amount in Lieu of Appointment on Compassionate Grounds is annexed as Annexure R-1.

5. That the details of the family members of the petitioner including his mother and the other financial details (Investment and liabilities) declared by the petitioner in the application form have been carefully examined and order dated 25/01/2018 (Annexure P-6) has been passed. The financial details (Investment and liabilities) declared by the petitioner in the application form which have been taken into consideration while considering the application of the petitioner dated 10/01/2017 for compassionate appointment are as follows:-

FINANCIAL DETAILS OF DECEASED EMPLOYEE	
<i>Terminal Benefits received</i>	<i>Amount (Rs.)</i>
<i>Provident Fund</i>	<i>10,47,247</i>
<i>Gratuity</i>	<i>10,00,000</i>
<i>Leave encashment</i>	<i>6,54,768</i>
<i>GSLIS</i>	<i>1,64,636</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>28,66,651</i>
<i>Less Liabilities (Loan taken from Bank)</i>	<i>6,17,353</i>
<i>Net Corpus of Terminal benefits</i>	<i>22,49,298</i>
<i>Investment:- PPF</i>	<i>1,45,000</i>
<i>Monthly Intt.@ 7.5% on net corpus of terminal benefits plus monthly intt. @ 7.5% on investment in PPF</i>	<i>14,058 + 906 =14,964</i>
<i>Family pension from Bank</i>	<i>21,202</i>
<i>Monthly income of dependent family member</i>	<i>32,931</i>
<i>Total monthly income of the family</i>	<i>69,097</i>
<i>Gross salary of the deceased employee after tax</i>	<i>73,279</i>
<i>60% of Gross Salary</i>	<i>43,967</i>



It can be seen that the above estimated monthly income of the family is more than 60% of last drawn salary of the father of the petitioner. It needs to be specifically mentioned here that the mother of the petitioner is in the Govt. Service and is working as an assistant/steno in Skill Development & Industrial Training Department, Panchkula. Since the mother of the petitioner is in Govt. Service, she is also entitled to reimbursement of medical facility from her employer and the issue of medical expenses has not been reported by petitioner in the application for compassionate appointment. The very fact that the family has been able to manage all these years is an adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence. The compassionate appointment/ex-gratia cases call for a great deal of circumspection. From this the competent authority has rightly come at the opinion that the financial condition of the family of the petitioner is not indigent in nature.

6. That the above mentioned facts amply demonstrate that the family of the petitioner has been able to manage all these years and that this is an adequate proof that the family had some dependable means of subsistence. In view of this, the case of the petitioner for compassionate appointment/ex-gratia has been rightly declined.”

6. In view of the stand taken by the respondents, I do not find any merit in the present writ petition. Accordingly, the same is hereby, **dismissed**.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

04.08.2026

Ayub/Saahil

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

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