



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

CWP-9743-2026

Date of decision: 02.04.2026

Suhavani Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Additional A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Divyansh Shukla, Advocate for
Mr. Sukhdeep Parmar, Advocate
for respondents No.3 & 4.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to select the petitioner being eligible and being scored higher marks than the last selected candidate for the post of LDC against advertisement No.3/2016 (Annexure P-1) for selection of candidate in Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (UHBVNL) and in Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (DHBVNL). Further, for directing respondent No.2 to include the name of the petitioner in the list of selected candidates as the petitioner has scored higher marks than the last selected candidate who is lower in merit as per final selection list dated 15.01.20255 (Annexure P-8).
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that respondent No.2 advertised 964 posts of LDC vide advertisement No.3/2016

**CWP-9743-2026****-2-**

dated 20.02.2016 (Annexure P-1). The petitioner being fully eligible participated in the selection process and remained successful in the written examination. The result was declared on 04.02.2017 (Annexure P-3). The petitioner was called for scrutiny of documents and interview. The final result was published on 08.06.2019 (Annexure P-5) but the petitioner's name was not included despite her having secured more marks than the last selected candidate. The petitioner filed CWP No.18610 of 2019 challenging the final result. The main writ petition bearing CWP No.17619 of 2019 was disposed of on 29.05.2024 (Annexure P-7). After the result of the petitioner was produced in a sealed cover along with the cut off marks obtained by the last selected candidate and the case was disposed of. Thereafter, more candidates were selected to obtain less marks than the petitioner and a final selection list was uploaded on 15.01.2025. The petitioner holds a valid certificate fulfils the eligibility criteria as discernible from Annexure P-9 and two posts in General Category are still available. He further submits that the similarly situated candidates have been granted relief by this Court in CWP No.4884 of 2026 titled as ***Hardeep Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 18.02.2026 (Annexure P-10) and COCP No.438 of 2025 titled as ***Aalekh Gupta and others Vs. Sh. Apporva Kumar Singh IAS and others*** decided on 28.05.2025 (Annexure P-12). The petitioner served a legal notice dated 20.02.2026 (Annexure P-14) but not action has been taken so far.

3. He further submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice (Annexure P-14) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.2 in terms of the judgments rendered by this Court in ***Hardeep Singh's case (supra)*** and ***Aalekh***



CWP-9743-2026

-3-

Gupta's case (supra) (Annexures P-10 & P-12, respectively) by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned State counsel, appearing on advanced notice as well as counsel appearing for respondents No.3 & 4, submit that they have no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.2 for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.2 is directed to consider the legal notice (Annexure P-14) of the petitioner in terms of the judgments rendered by this Court in *Hardeep Singh's case (supra)* and *Aalekh Gupta's case (supra)* (Annexures P-10 & P-12, respectively) and pass a speaking order, after affording her an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 02 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.2.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

02.04.2026

Neha

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