



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

136

CWP-9253-2026

Date of Decision: 27.03.2026

SARLA

...Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Ms. Suyma, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of communication dated 16.07.2024 whereby her claim for compensation under Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Antyodaya Parivar Suraksha Yojna (for short 'Deen Dayal Yojna') has been rejected on the ground of delay.

2. As per petition, the petitioner's husband passed away on 30.09.2023. He was 39 years' old. His annual family income as per Parivar Pehchan Patra was less than Rs.1,00,000/-. She filed online application on 03.02.2024 seeking compensation under Deen Dayal Yojna. The respondent has rejected her claim on the ground that application was filed beyond 90 days.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Deen Dayal Yojna was introduced on 24.05.2023. No limitation was prescribed in the



original scheme, however, vide notification dated 09.11.2023 limitation period of 90 days was inserted. The petitioner filed application within 90 days from the date of amending notification, thus, application was within limitation.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel submits that petitioner was supposed to file application within 90 days from the date of incident. The period prescribed by notification dated 09.11.2023 is applicable retrospectively.

5. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

6. Concededly, the limitation period under Deen Dayal Yojan was inserted by notification dated 09.11.2023. The aforesaid Yojna is a beneficial legislation. It is a settled proposition of law that beneficial schemes are required to be interpreted liberally. The petitioner applied within 90 days from the date of amendment whereby limitation period was inserted. Normally, procedural amendments are considered retrospective, however, any amendment which affects vested right cannot be retrospective unless specifically provided in the amending notification. In the present case, in the notification it was not provided that amendment is retrospective. The Deen Dayal Yojna created right in favour of petitioner, thus, said right could not be infringed or taken away by treating amendment retrospective. Learned State Counsel during the course of hearing has confirmed that Chief Minister has approved to extend aforesaid 90 days period to six months. Matter is under consideration with Cabinet of Ministers.



7. In the wake of above discussion and findings, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly allowed. The respondents are directed to release payment as per Deen Dayal Yojna within two months from today.

8. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 27, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No