IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.20831 of 2026

Decided on: 23rd November, 2026

Dharmender **.....Petitioner**

Versus

Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board Limited and others **.....Respondents**

Coram

Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the Petitioner: Mr. R.L. Chaudhary, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Deepak Sharma, Advocate.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge

This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *"(i) That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondent authority to decide the representation dated 02.09.2026 (Annexure P-2) within a time bound manner.*
>
> *(ii) That writ of mandamus may kindly be issued, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner for appointment against the vacant posts of Junior Helper/Junior T. Mate as per his merit in accordance with law."*

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and considered the case file.

---

[1] **Whether reporters of print and electronic media may be allowed to see the order? Yes.**

3. Petitioner's case is that on 28.11.2020, the respondent-authorities had notified 1832 posts of Junior Helper and Junior T-Mate for their filling up in accordance with the criteria prescribed in the notification. Petitioner was eligible and applied for the post. The result was declared by the respondents. Petitioner could not make it in the selection list, whereunder, the respondent-Board had filled up only 1500 out of notified 1832 posts. That 332 posts of Junior Helpers/Junior T-Mate are still lying vacant.

Learned counsel for the petitioner strongly urges that after giving appointments to 25 persons as Junior Helper/Junior T-Mate on the basis of aforesaid result and after the joining of such Junior Helpers/Junior T-Mates, the respondent-Board recently withdrew the appointment orders from these 25 incumbents on account of some of their documents having been discovered to be fake. Petitioner seeks appointment against one of these 25 posts statedly lying vacant at present. It is his grievance that his representation preferred in that regard on 02.09.2026 (Annexure P-2) has not been decided as yet.

4. Save and except for petitioner's representation, which admittedly was preferred for the first time on

02.09.2026, the only other document appended with the writ petition is the criteria for evaluation/verification of documents for assigning marks etc., apparently supplied to the petitioner on 28.11.2020 (Annexure P-1). Copy of the advertisement, upon which the case is based, is not placed on record. Applicable Recruitment & Promotion Rules, if any, are neither appended nor have been referred to in the petition. Even the result and petitioner's place in the merit therein, are not reflected by the case record. The dates of declaration of result, filling up of posts, issuance of appointment orders etc. are not discernible from the case. Petitioner's assertion that some vacant posts, though advertised, but not filled up, is also not substantiated by any document. It appears that qua this, even otherwise, the cause of action perhaps had accrued to the petitioner much earlier. Petition is absolutely silent about any steps taken by the petitioner till 02.09.2026 for redressal of his grievances. Learned counsel for the petitioner insists for decision of petition in its existing form and pleadings.

During hearing, claim was pressed against 25 posts of Junior Helpers and Junior T-Mates stated to be lying vacant at present. To a query of the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that even these 25

posts had been filled up at one point of time, but on account of documents of the incumbents appointed against these posts having been subsequently found to be fake, the appointment orders were withdrawn from them. Given this, in view of the settled legal position, the petitioner, even if waitlisted (though no merit/waiting list has been appended with the petition), cannot seek appointment against the posts, which had been filled up at one point of time and got vacant subsequently.

5. In view of above, the relief claimed for by the petitioner cannot be granted to him at this stage, more so, considering the pleadings and the documents appended with the petition. Accordingly, the present writ petition fails and is dismissed. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

November 23, 2026
Mukesh