

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

**CWP No.20673 of 2016  
Date of Decision: 03.10.2016**

Naurang Singh .....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited & others ....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. Hemant Bassi, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**RAJESH BINDAL, J**

The petitioner has approached this Court seeking quashing of the revised promotion policy dated 15.07.2008 and communications dated 20.03.2009 and 28.11.2011, vide which representations made by the petitioner for promotion were rejected.

The grievance of the petitioner is that he was working as a Technician Grade-I and should have been promoted to the post of Assistant Foreman but he was promoted as Senior Technician.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, we do not find any reason to entertain the present petition at this belated stage. Admittedly, the persons against whom the petitioner is raising grievance regarding promotion to the post of Assistant Foreman were promoted vide order dated 08.12.2008. Immediately thereafter, the petitioner made a representation, which was rejected vide communication dated 20.03.2009. The petitioner kept quiet. He retired from service on 31.05.2011 and thereafter subsequently representation was made by the

petitioner, vide letter dated 05.09.2011 after he had already retired from service. The rejection thereof was conveyed to the petitioner vide memo dated 28.11.2011.

Considering the fact that the petitioner is raising the issue regarding the promotion to the post of Assistant Foreman about 8 years after the promotions were made and more than 5 years after the petitioner had retired from the service, the petition would be barred on account of delay and laches. The first representation of the petitioner was rejected on 20.03.2009. The petitioner never thought of challenging the order as he filed writ petition for the first time in this Court in 2012 i.e. CWP No.3343 of 2012, which was dismissed as withdrawn on 21.09.2015 with liberty to impugn the promotion policy. As the main claim of the petitioner itself is highly belated, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

Ordered accordingly.

**[ RAJESH BINDAL ]**  
**JUDGE**

**[ DARSHAN SINGH ]**  
**JUDGE**

03.10.2016

Vinay

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No