



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

CWP-15880-2025

Date of Decision: 28.05.2025

Sachin Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Raman Sharma, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondent to issue appointment letter for the post of Assistant Lineman (in short 'ALM').

2. The petitioner pursuant to advertisement dated 20.03.2022 applied for the post of ALM. He is having requisite qualification i.e. Matric with ITI, however, he has not secured 60% marks in ITI.

3. Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this Court vide judgment dated 21.05.2025 passed in ***CWP-7612-2024*** titled as ***"Parmod Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others"*** has held that there is no requirement to secure 60% marks in ITI and case of petitioner is squarely covered by said judgment.



4. On being confronted with Paragraph No.18 of aforesaid judgment, Mr. Sunil Kumar Nehra submits that he cannot be called as fence sitter because he has filed instant petition within few days from the date of passing said judgment and there is no order whereby candidature of petitioner has been cancelled.

5. The case of petitioner *prima facie* seems to be covered by afore-cited judgment, however, in the said judgment it has been categorically mentioned that benefit of the judgment would be available to those candidates who have approached this Court on or before the date of judgment. The said para for the ready reference is reproduced as below:-

“18. This order may prompt fence sitters to file petitions before this court which would create chaos. To avoid further litigation, it is hereby made clear that the benefit of this judgment shall be available only to those candidates who have approached this Court on or before the date of this judgment.”

6. In the wake of afore-cited categoric findings, the instant petition cannot be entertained.

7. Dismissed.

28.05.2025
shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

Yes
No