

2026:PHHC:084890



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

105+147 (2 cases)

Date of decision:26.05.2026

1.

CWP-24122-2025(O&M)

Vicky and others

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

2.

CWP-16965-2026

Rubi

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present : Mr. Shreenath A. Khemka with Ms. Tvesha Gupta, Advocates
for the petitioners in both cases.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)**CM-8215-CWP-2026 in CWP-24122-2025**

The present application has been filed on the ground that the
issue involved in the present writ petition already stands settled by this



Court in ***CWP-7612-2024 and other connected matters*** titled as ***Pramod Kumar and others Versus State of Haryana and others***, decided on 21.05.2025. It is contended that the petitioners are identically situated and are claiming the same relief and consequential benefits as granted in the aforesaid judgment. It is further submitted that the judgment rendered in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** has attained finality and has already been implemented by the respondent-authorities and, therefore, the case of the present petitioners is squarely covered by the said judgment.

Learned counsel further submits that the judgment passed in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** was affirmed by a Division Bench of this Court in ***LPA-1799-2025*** titled as ***Sachin Kumar Versus UHBVNL, Panchkula and others***, decided on 02.02.2026, wherein it was further clarified that the principle relating to “fence sitters” would not be applicable to the petitioners therein.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 in both the cases is not in a position to controvert the factual or legal position nor is he able to distinguish the case of the present petitioners from the case of ***Pramod Kumar (supra)***. It is also not disputed that the judgment rendered in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** has attained finality and stands implemented by the respondents.

In view of the above, the present application is allowed, as prayed for.



The main case is ordered to be taken up on the regular Board for hearing/disposal.

MAIN

1. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the aforesaid writ petitions are being taken up together for adjudication, as they arise out of a common set of facts and involve identical questions of law. However, for the sake of brevity and convenience, the facts are being extracted from **CWP-16965-2026**.
2. The present writ petition(s) has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to grant appointment to the petitioner(s) on the post of Assistant Lineman (Cat. No.195) in UHBVNL in terms of the revised result dated 18.05.2026 (Annexure P-7), along with all consequential benefits including arrears and seniority.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner(s), *inter alia*, contends that pursuant to the recruitment process undertaken by the respondent-Nigam, a revised result dated 18.05.2026 (Annexure P-7) was issued whereby the petitioner was declared selected for the post of Assistant Lineman. However, when the petitioner approached the respondent-Nigam for joining duties on 20.05.2026, she was not permitted to join on the ground that she did not fulfil the eligibility criteria, inasmuch as she had secured 55.82% marks in diploma, whereas minimum 60% marks were allegedly required.



4 Learned counsel further submits that the aforesaid issue already stands conclusively settled by this Court in ***CWP-7612-2024 and other connected matters*** titled as ***Pramod Kumar and others Versus State of Haryana and others***, decided on 21.05.2025, wherein it has categorically been held that the requirement of minimum 60% marks was not applicable to degree/diploma holders and was confined only to candidates possessing National Apprenticeship Certificate awarded under the Apprenticeship Act, 1961. Learned counsel also places reliance upon the judgment rendered by this Court in ***CWP-31244-2025*** titled as ***Inderaj Vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others***, decided on 25.03.2026, and submits that the case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgments, which have attained finality and already stand implemented by the respondent-authorities.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.2 is not in a position to controvert the factual or legal position nor is he able to distinguish the case of the petitioner(s) from the judgments rendered in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** and ***Inderaj (supra)***. It is also not disputed that the aforesaid judgments have attained finality and stand implemented.

6. In view of the settled legal position noticed hereinabove, both the present writ petitions are disposed of in terms of the judgments rendered in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** and ***Inderaj (supra)***. The respondents are directed to pass fresh speaking orders in terms of aforesaid judgments,

2026:PHHC:084890



within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

7. It is made clear that any wilful deviation or non-compliance of the directions issued by this Court shall entail consequences under Article 215 of the Constitution of India and it shall be open to the petitioner(s) to seek initiation of appropriate contempt proceedings in accordance with law.

8. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

9. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of connected case(s).

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

26.05.2026
Puneet Chawla

Whether speaking/reasoned. : Yes/No
Whether Reportable. : Yes/No