

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

Date of Decision : 18.03.2015

1. CWP No. 16042 of 1993(O&M)

Satbir Singh Sheoran and others

.... Petitioners

vs.

Haryana State Electricity Board, Panchkula & others

.... Respondents

2. CWP No. 6399 of 1994(O&M)

Sukhbir Singh Malik

.... Petitioner

vs.

Haryana State Electricity Board, Panchkula

.... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present: Mr.K.L.Arora, Advocate for the petitioners
 in CWP No.16042 of 1993.

 Mr.Ashwani Talwar, Advocate for the petitioner
 in CWP No.6399 of 1994.

 Mr.Mohnish Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.1.

 Mr.Subhash Ahuja, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 15
 in CWP No.16042 of 1993.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This order shall dispose of the above mentioned two writ

petitions. Since common questions of law and facts are involved therein, they are being decided by this common order.

By these two petitions, the petitioners have challenged the action of the respondents in promoting other persons instead of them.

The petitioners were all Engineers Subordinates (Junior Engineers) who either had a degree or obtained a degree of B.E./AMIE.

The precise grievance is that the respondent - the erstwhile Haryana State Electricity Board did not adhere to its own regulations while making promotions. It is common cause before me that during the pendency of these writ petitions, these and similar issues have been decided by this Court first in the case of **Haryana State Electricity Board, Panchkula Vs. Rajender Singh Redhu and others, LPA No.657 of 1997** decided on 17.12.2014 and **CWP No.16330 of 2005 titled as Parveen Arora and others v. Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited and others** decided on 09.01.2014. It is also a common cause that in both these judgments, two Division Benches of this Court have directed the respondents to prepare a fresh seniority list as per their regulations which were promulgated from time to time. To that extent these writ petitions have been rendered infructuous in view of the decisions mentioned supra.

Learned counsel for the petitioners have, however, argued that even 15 months after the passing of judgment in case of Pawan Arora and others(supra) the respondents have not yet finalized the lists and it is the vested interest of the Board and its successors to keep this 25 years old pot boiling.

Learned counsel for the respondents states that the list has been finalized after dealing with the objections and the names of all the

candidates including the petitioners will also be considered within a period of three months.

No other point has been raised.

In these circumstances these writ petitions stand disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the cases of all the candidates including the petitioners and then pass orders in respect of all such persons after considering their claims from the due dates as per the regulations.

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE

March 18, 2015
sunita