

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

**CWP No. 15832 OF 2017
DECIDED ON: AUGUST 23, 2017**

JAI NARAIN

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

**HARYANA VIDHUT PARSARAN NIGAM LTD.RESPONDENTS
AND OTHERS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Thakan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought issuance of writ in the nature of certiorari to quash order dated 29.05.2017 (Annexure P-4) and to grant extra increment, seniority, pension as per instructions dated 20.07.1965 (Annexure P-1) as well as letter dated 09.02.2017 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has furnished a copy of order dated 21.04.2017 passed by Superintending Engineer/Admn-II, HVPNL, Panchkula, in Court today and the same is taken on record.

3. The contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner made a request to the respondent(s) for grant of aforesaid benefits, which have been claimed through instant petition but the same was declined by

Superintending Engineer, HVPNL, Panchkula, which was subsequently conveyed to the petitioner vide letter dated 29.05.2017 (Annexure P-4). In fact, perusal of aforesaid letters dated 21.04.2017 as well as 29.05.2017, transpire that same are non-speaking orders and nothing has been disclosed by the concerned authority as to what are the reasons on account of which, the petitioner is not entitled to the aforesaid benefits.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that similar question arose for determination before this Court in two connected petitions bearing CWP No.3773 of 1994 & CWP No. 19913 of 2010, which were allowed on 09.12.2013.

5. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Superintendent Engineer, T.S. Circle, HVPNL, Hisar to reconsider the case of the petitioner in the light of above referred documents/judgments and then to decide the same by passing a speaking order, that too, after hearing the petitioner, within a period of 3 months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. However, if the petitioner still feels aggrieved against the order passed by the concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

AUGUST 23, 2017
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes***

Whether reportable ***Yes/No***