



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

CWP-4565-2024 (O & M)
Date of decision: 03.09.2025

SANDEEP RATHI AND OTHERS

...PETITIONERS

V/S

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LIMITED AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sunil K. Nehra, Advocate
Mr. Viren Nehra, Advocate and
Mr. Rahul Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jagbir Malik, Advocate for respondent No.1.
(through video conferencing)

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. Present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of Constitution of India for quashing of impugned order dated 09.02.2024 (Annexure P-15), vide which, the provisional appointment letter for the post of Shift Attendant issued to petitioner No.4 has been cancelled and for issuance of directions of joining of petitioners on their respective posts.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the controversy involved in the present petition qua petitioner Nos.1 to 3 is squarely covered by the judgment rendered by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Parmod Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others*** in ***CWP No. 7612 of 2024*** decided on ***21.05.2025***. Learned counsel further submits that even in the judgment passed in the case of ***Parmod Kumar*** (*supra*), liberty was granted to file a separate representation on behalf of the petitioners, who were Shift



Attendants. Lastly, learned counsel submits that the petitioners have filed the instant writ petition prior to the decision of the judgment in *Parmod Kumar (supra)* on 21.05.2025, as such, the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by the paragraph 18 of the said judgment.

3. Learned counsel for respondent-corporation could not controvert the fact that the case of petitioner Nos.1 to 3, who were working as Assistant Linemen, is required to be considered in terms of the aforementioned judgment. He submits that petitioners have sought a writ of mandamus without representing the respondent-corporation.

4. In view of the above, the present petition stands disposed of with a direction to treat the present petition as comprehensive representation and decide the same in accordance with law after affording an opportunity to petitioner Nos.1 to 3 to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if petitioner Nos.1 to 3 are found entitled to the relief sought, the same including all consequential benefits and notional seniority shall be granted forthwith by the respondent(s). Petitioner No.4 would be at liberty to file his separate writ petition on the same cause of action, in terms of the liberty granted in *Parmod Kumar (supra)*.

5. Disposed of accordingly.

6. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

September 03, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No