

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

**CWP-419-2017**

**Date of decision : 15.02.2023**

Gurdeep Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and another

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. A.K. Walia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.P.S. Thethi, Advocate for the respondents.

**PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

Present writ petition has been filed seeking writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count the service of the petitioner as lineman for the purpose of counting his service for the grant of Time Bound Higher Pay Scales after completion of 9/16/23 years of services. He further prays for allowing the petitioner to change his induction post from Sub Station Attendant to Lineman.

Petitioner claims parity with Jagroop Singh. Jagroop Singh also earlier inducted as lineman. Later on he was directly recruited as J.E. He vide representation Annexure P-7/T sought change of induction post from Lineman to that of J.E. as he was directly recruited as J.E. In the case of the petitioner, the petitioner was earlier recruited as Lineman but later on was directly recruited and appointed as Sub Station Attendant. His induction post was taken to be that of Sub Station Attendant.

He prays that the same be changed to that of Lineman. The policy decision providing for time bound benefits of promotional scale specifically provided as under:-

*'Of an employee already in the service of the Board is directly appointed to a higher post through open selection then for the purpose of grant of time bound promotional/devised promotional scale in that cadre counting of the period of service will commence from the date of joining the above post by direct recruitment'.*

Thus, it was owing to the fact that the petitioner, who was directly appointed to a higher post through open selection that his higher post i.e. Sub Station Attendant was taken as induction post.

Mr. Walia, could not point out any infirmity in the action of the respondents. His arguments is purely based on parity with Jagroop Singh and claims that once Jagroop Singh has been allowed to change his induction post, he should also be allowed. Arguments raised is misplaced. Jagroop Singh was allowed to change his induction post in consonance with the policy decision whereas the prayer made by the petitioner runs counter to the policy decision. Rather the case of the petitioner has already been rightly considered in terms of the policy.

Resultantly, no relief as claimed for, can be granted.

Petition stands dismissed.

15.02.2023

ps-I

(PANKAJ JAIN)  
JUDGE

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |