



118

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

CWP-10425-2026

Date of decision: 07.04.2026

Rajneesh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**Present:** Mr. Vineet Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioner.Mr. Pradeep Sharma, Advocate (through V.C.) and
Ms. Radhika Deekshay, Advocate
for the respondents.**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 decide the charge sheet issued to the petitioner. Further, for directing the respondents to consider and decide the representation dated 27.02.2026 (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner joined the respondent-Department on 31.03.1997 as a Lineman and earned promotion from time to time. On 21.07.2025, he was issued a charge sheet. The petitioner submitted a detailed reply to the charge sheet on 11.08.2025. In spite of passing considerable time, no proceedings whatsoever have been carried out by the respondent-Department. The petitioner relies upon the departmental instructions dated 22.05.2024 (Annexure P-1) which requires conclusion of the departmental inquiry within a period of three months. The



CWP-10425-2026

-2-

petitioner approached the department on numerous occasions, especially, by way of representation dated 27.02.2026 (Annexure P-2), however, his grievance has not been redressed. The disciplinary proceedings kept pending for an indefinite period only to dislodge the claim of the petitioner for his consideration for further promotion.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents-Corporation submits that the petitioner, along with five others, has been charge-sheeted, and as a result, there has been some delay in concluding the departmental inquiry due to the significant financial implications involved. However, he could not controvert the fact that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No. 958 of 2010 titled as *Prem Nath Bali vs. Registrar, High Court of Delhi and another* and this Court in CWP No.9606 of 2022 titled as *Khairati Lal Vs. State of Haryana and others* decided on 13.10.2025, have categorically held that every employee has a right to the conclusion of departmental proceedings within a reasonable time.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusal of the record with their able assistance, it transpires that the charge sheet was served upon the petitioner on 21.07.2025 to which he submitted a detailed reply on 11.08.2025. Thereafter, sufficient time has passed, the respondents have not been able to concluded the departmental inquiry/proceedings against the petitioner in spite of the issuance of instructions dated 22.05.2024 (Annexure P-1).

5. In view of the controversy involved in the present case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents-Corporation to decide/conclude the departmental inquiry/proceedings within a period of three

**CWP-10425-2026****-3-**

months from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

6. Needless to say, the petitioner would not delay the departmental inquiry in any manner and will fully cooperate.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

07.04.2026*Neha*

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