



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

\*\*\*

150

**CWP-8763-2026**

**Date of Decision: 23.03.2026**

WAKAR YUNUS

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY &  
OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate with  
Mr. Mukul Chauhan, Advocate for petitioner

Ms. Svaneel Jaswal, Addl. A.G., Haryana

Mr. Mohammad Arshad, Advocate  
For respondent Nos.7 to 9

\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking writ of quo warranto calling upon respondents No.7 to 9 to show authority under which they are discharging duties of outsourced Assistant Linemen (ALMs) in Sub-division, Punhana, District Nuh despite discrepancies in their age and eligibility. He is further seeking direction to Respondents to undertake verification qua age, educational qualifications and technical qualifications of respondents No.7 to 9 and pass speaking order on his complaints dated 28.05.2024 and 11.06.2024.



2. Mr. Mohammad Arshad, Advocate has appeared and filed memorandum of appearance on behalf of respondent Nos.7 to 9. The same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

3. Respondent No. 7 to 9 are working as outsourced ALMs in OP Sub-Division Punhana, District Nuh, under DHBVNL. They were appointed pursuant to Deployment of Contractual Persons Policy, 2022 dated 30.06.2022. As per official record of the respondents, there is serious discrepancy qua age, educational qualification and technical qualification of respondents No.7 to 9. Date of Birth of Respondent no.7 & 8 is 05.02.1994 and 04.04.1969 respectively and their date of joining is 01.07.2011 and 11.11.2012 respectively. They were either underage or overage at the time of appointment. They are governed by 2022 Policy and cannot be retained due to age and qualification ineligibility. They are holding a technical operational post despite age and qualification ineligibility. Petitioner submitted complaints dated 28.05.2024 and 11.06.2024 before DHBVNL and at CM window but to no avail. He also filed application dated 22.05.2025 under RTI Act. As per reply, educational/ITI documents of respondents No.7 to 9 are not available in the official records.

4. Learned State counsel submits that competent authority would look into petitioner's representations and take an appropriate decision.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner agrees to the aforesaid arrangement.

6. In the wake of statement of both sides, the petition stands disposed of.

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**23.03.2026**  
SDK

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |