



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

215-1

CWP-14393-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.05.2024

Sandeep Kumar ...Petitioner

VERSUS

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and Ors. ...Respondents

215-2

CWP-12161-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.05.2024

Amit Kumar ...Petitioner

VERSUS

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and Ors. ...Respondents

215-3

CWP-18323-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 29.05.2024

Pardeep Kumar ...Petitioner

VERSUS

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and Ors. ...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. B.S. Mittal, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Ms. Khushboo, Advocate for
Mr. Padamkant Dwivedi, Advocate,
for respondents No.1 to 4 in CWP-14393-2018 and
for respondents No.1 to 3 in CWP-12161-2022.

Mr. Gaurav Deep Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.4 in CWP-18323-2022.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. These three writ petitions are being decided by a common order



since the issues involved in the petitions are identical. A reference is made to the facts from **CWP-14393-2018** titled as **Sandeep Kumar** Vs. **Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and Ors.**

2. Challenge in the petition is to the impugned ranking list (Annexure P-6) and the promotion order dated 31.07.2012 (Annexure P-7) issued by respondent-Nigam and further revised ranking list (Annexure P-16) vide which respondent No.5, who is junior to the petitioner has been promoted to the post of Junior Engineer from the post of Assistant Lineman.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the said issue has already been dealt with by this Court in **CWP-3403-2015** titled **Vinod Kumar** Vs. **Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Hisar and ors.** and the same was allowed vide order dated 02.08.2016. Latter Patent Appeal bearing No.205 of 2017 was dismissed by a Division Bench of this Court vide order dated 09.08.2017 and even the Special Leave Petition against the same has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. He submits that the respondents have admitted in their reply about the applicability of the order passed in the matter of **Vinod Kumar** (supra). He thus submits that the issued being covered by the said order, similar benefit ought to be extended to the petitioner as well.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents are not in a position to controvert that the issue is not covered by the order passed by this Court in the matter of **Vinod Kumar** (supra), which has already been upheld in the LPA as well as by the subsequent dismissal of SLP.



5. In view of the said undisputed aspect, all the three writ petitions are **disposed of** in terms of order dated 02.08.2016 passed by this Court in the matter of **Vinod Kumar** (supra).

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

29.05.2024

Mangal Singh

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