

2026:PHHC:086171



CWP-17969-2026

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

143

CWP-17969-2026

Date of decision: **29.05.2026**

Naveen

.....Petitioner

**VERSUS**

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR**

Present : Mr. Shreenath A. Khemka, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Piyush Khanna, Addl. AG Haryana.

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

\*\*\*\*

**HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (Oral)**

1. The present writ petition 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 as Assistant Lineman (Cat. No. 195) in UHBVNL as per the revised result dated 18.05.2026 (Annexure P-7), along with consequential benefits including



CWP-17969-2026

arrears and seniority. A further prayer has been made for interim relief directing that one post of Assistant Lineman (Cat. No. 195) be kept reserved for the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the action of the respondents in denying appointment to the petitioner on the ground that he secured 59.42% marks in Diploma in Electrical Engineering is wholly arbitrary, illegal and contrary to the terms of the advertisement as well as the settled position of law. The petitioner possesses a Diploma in Electrical Engineering, which is a higher qualification than the prescribed qualification. The condition regarding minimum 60% marks is applicable only in cases of National Apprenticeship Certificate under the Apprenticeship Act, 1961 and not to candidates possessing Degree/Diploma qualifications.

2.1. The controversy is no longer *res integra* in view of the judgment passed by this Court in ***Pramod Kumar & Ors. v. State of Haryana & Ors., CWP No. 7612 of 2024***, wherein this Court has categorically held that the requirement of minimum 60% marks is not applicable to candidates possessing Degree/Diploma qualifications and is confined only to candidates holding National Apprenticeship Certificate under the Apprenticeship Act, 1961. Despite the petitioner having been duly



CWP-17969-2026

selected in the revised result dated 18.05.2026, the respondents have illegally refused to permit him to join duties, which action deserves to be set aside. 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.

3. 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 from the judgment rendered in ***Pramod Kumar (supra)*** and ***Inderaj (supra)***. It is also not disputed that the aforesaid judgment has attained finality and stand implemented.

4. In view of the settled legal position noticed here-in-above, the present writ petition is 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, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

2026.PHHC:086171



CWP-17969-2026

5. 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 to seek initiation of appropriate contempt proceedings in accordance with law.

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

**(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)**  
**JUDGE**

**29.05.2026***parul verma*

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