



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH.**

123

CWP-8114-2026.**Date of Decision: 17.03.2026.**

Ajay Kumar and others

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Hisar and othersRespondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Devender S. Punia, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to release the arrears of salary from June, 2012 to November, 2016 of Assistant Lineman (ALM) as well as Shift Attendants (SA) along with interest thereon, arbitrarily reduced by the respondent-Nigam in view of the judgment dated 08.02.2024 (Annexure P-2) passed by this Court in **CWP No.2244 of 2017** titled as **Saurabh Kaushik and others vs. DHBVN, Hisar and others.**

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners, *inter alia*, submits that inaction of the respondents in not releasing the arrears of salary from June, 2012 to November, 2016, is illegal and unconstitutional. The controversy in the present case is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court passed in **Saurabh Kaushik's** case (*supra*), wherein this Court has already directed the respondent-Nigam to pay the arrears along with interest to similarly situated employees. The respondents' failure to act upon legal notice dated 18.01.2026

(Annexure P-3) is contrary to the judgment of this Court in Saurabh Kaushik's case (supra). He submits that at this stage the petitioners would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the respondents to decide the legal notice dated 18.01.2026 (Annexure P-3), by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent-Nigam submits that the right of the petitioners crystallized in November, 2016 and they remained indolent and have not approached this Court, whereas the identically circumstanced employees were diligent and they had approached this Court in the year 2017 and the petitioners are fence-sitters, who have come forward now once a favourable order has been passed in favour of the other employees. However, he submits that the legal notice dated 18.01.2026 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners would be decided in a time bound manner.

4. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners, respondent No.1 is directed to consider the legal notice dated 18.01.2026 (Annexure P-3), of the petitioners and pass a speaking order, after affording them an opportunity 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 petitioners. Needless to say, if the petitioners are found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by the respondents.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

17.03.2026
jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No