



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

117

**CWP-26193-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 08.09.2025**

Reena

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Narayan Prasad Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the order/letter dated 21.07.2025 bearing memo No. 331/Ch-42/HPGCL/Rectt-284 (Annexure P-31) vide which the claim of employment has been constructed to be relinquished. Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to give appointment as per policy dated 14.02.2012 (Annexure P-1) and further as per the order No.29/HPGCL/Rectt.-125/Vol-1 dated 29.03.2024 (Annexure P-5) in compliance of the judgment/order dated 07.08.2023 (Annexure P-3) and documents/affidavits submitted by the petitioner time to time as mentioned in the petition (Annexures P-4, P-6 to



P- 10, P-13 to P-17) and further by considering the legal Notice dated 06.06.2025 (Annexure P-18).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that with regard to the joint land of the petitioner's family, one more person namely Parveen son of Geena Devi has filed a petition i.e. CWP No.25631 of 2018, who has already given up his claim and has also given an affidavit in favour of the petitioner. Pursuant to which the Managing director of respondent/Corporation has considered the case of the petitioner and issued office order on 29.03.2024 (Annexure P-5), finding the case of the petitioner feasible in terms of the policy and it was placed before the competent authority for positive consideration, however, vide impugned order, the claim of the petitioner was declined only on the ground that the affidavits of some of the co-sharers have not been submitted. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that no other person except Parveen was eligible to seek employment in terms of the policy, who has already relinquished his claim in favour of the petitioner and the impugned order dated 21.07.2025 (Annexure P-31) passed in a mechanical manner primarily on the ground that the petitioner has failed to provide the affidavits of other claimants.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, appearing on advance notice, on instructions from Mr. Vijay Kumar Jindal, Chief Engineer (Administration), HPGCL, submits that the case of the petitioner is under active consideration and the respondent/Corporation would not act upon the order dated 21.07.2025



(Annexure P-31) and will consider the case of the petitioner within a period of two months from today.

4. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 4, the present petition is allowed. The order/letter dated 21.07.2025 bearing memo No.331/Ch-42/HPGCL/Rectt-284 (Annexure P-31) is quashed and the respondent/Corporation is directed to consider the case of the petitioner within a period of two months from today and if she is found eligible in accordance with the applicable qualifications and criteria, and there is no other claimant *qua* the acquired land, the relief sought shall be granted to her forthwith.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

08.09.2025
yakub

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