



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

112

**CWP-11592-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision: 18.04.2026**

Rajender Singh

....Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Viren Nehra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondent No.1 to decide the Second Appeal dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-3) submitted by the petitioner in view of the Notification dated 12.05.2020 (Annexure P-4) in a time-bound manner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner was dismissed from service in an illegal manner. Thereafter, the petitioner filed a statutory appeal before the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVNL, Rohtak on 23.12.2023, which was rejected vide order dated 14.11.2025 (Annexure P-2). Subsequently, the petitioner preferred a second appeal before the Managing Director of the



respondent/Nigam, which, according to the petitioner, is maintainable in view of the Notification dated 12.05.2020 (Annexure P-4).

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents/Nigam, submits that the second appeal filed by the petitioner is not maintainable in terms of Rule 12 of UHBVNL Punishment & Appeal Regulations, 2017. He refers to Annexure P-4 and submits that under Note 2 attached with the Notification, it has been clearly mentioned that the second appeal would lie only in cases where the punishment has been enhanced by the First Appellate Authority, which is not the issue in the present case. As such, the Second Appeal dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-3) submitted by the petitioner is not maintainable.

4. Be that as it may, in view of the limited relief sought by the petitioner, the respondents/Nigam are directed to pass a reasoned and speaking order on the Second Appeal dated 08.12.2025 (Annexure P-3), after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 08 weeks from today. It is clarified that the respondents/Nigam shall be at liberty to examine the issue of maintainability, in accordance with law.

5. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

18.04.2026
yakub

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