



CWP-13068-2026

-1-

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

123

CWP-13068-2026

Date of Decision: 30.04.2026

Shivcharan Singh Sahi

...Petitioner

Versus

The Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others**...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. H.S. Dhindsa, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Ankit Gaur, Advocate for the respondents
(*through video conferencing*)

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to official respondents to look into the matter of non-extension of work order regarding the vehicle taken on hire by respondent No.4 which is in violation of Corporate Transport Policy dated 31.01.2023 of Punjab State Power Corporation Limited ('PSPCL'). He is further seeking direction to respondents to decide his representations.

2. The petitioner was allotted outsource work order for hire of transport vehicle under the policy of respondent-PSPCL for the period from 26.09.2024 to 25.09.2025. His contract was not renewed after the expiry of said term. He served representations dated 24.09.2025 and 22.02.2026 upon the respondent for renewal of his contract but the same have not been addressed till date. Action of the respondent is violative of policy dated 31.01.2023.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per Corporate Transport Policy, the work order for outsourcing of vehicles is extendable on year-to-year basis. The initial period is one year and it may be extended for further two years. After three years, the respondent has to float fresh tender. The petitioner was awarded work order for 1 year i.e. 26.09.2024 to 25.09.2025. He had purchased vehicle against loan. He was having legitimate expectation that his vehicle would be hired for at least 3 years.

4. Mr. Ankit Gaur, Advocate, who on advance notice is present in Court on behalf of respondents, submits that as per policy, the respondent may refuse to extend work order, if there is deficiency in the performance of the vehicle or service provider.

5. On being asked, he could not point out any order/communication disclosing that there was deficiency in the vehicle or service provider, however, submits that petitioner on 2-3 occasions was pointed out that he has not used yellow number plate and without permission remained on leave.

6. Heard the arguments and perused the record.

7. From the perusal of Clause (iv) of Paragraph 2(C) of the policy, it is evident that respondent is not bound to extend period of work order, however, cannot arbitrarily or mechanically refuse to extend. The initial period of work order is one year which is extendable upto 3 years. If two additional years are not granted, the vehicle owner may suffer irreparable loss. At the same moment, if the vehicle owner is not performing as per satisfaction, the service recipient has every right not to extend the work

**CWP-13068-2026****-3-**

order. The respondent has not made any communication disclosing reasons for not extending work order.

8. In the backdrop, this Court finds it appropriate to direct respondents to consider petitioner's claim and record reasons, if is of the opinion that work order should not be extended. Let the needful be done within 2 weeks from today. The petitioner shall be communicated reasons recorded by respondent.

9. Disposed of in above terms.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

30.04.2026*Mohit Kumar*

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