



103

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

**FAO-M-235-2012 (O&M)**

**Date of decision: February 20, 2025**

Harjitpal Kaur

....Appellant

versus

Jhirmal Singh

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

**Present:-** Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate for the respondent.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUDHIR SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

At the outset, learned counsel for the respondent points out that during the pendency of the appeal, the respondent (husband of the appellant) has expired. He has produced a copy of discharge summary of Vinayak Hospital, Sunam, in this regard. The same is taken on record and is marked as 'X' for reference. He submits that in view thereof, the present appeal has become infructuous.

2. On the other hand, learned counsel for the appellant does not dispute the aforesaid. He however, points out that the respondent/husband was a Government employee and seeks liberty for claiming pensionary benefits of the respondent/husband.

3. Considering the same, instant appeal is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. If so advised, the appellant may move an appropriate

**FAO-M-235-2012 (O&M)**

application before the appropriate forum *qua* claiming pensionary benefits of the deceased/husband.

4. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

**(SUDHIR SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**(SUKHVINDER KAUR)  
JUDGE**

**February 20, 2025**  
mahavir

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable: Yes/No