



203 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-30826-2018
Date of decision: 20.02.2026

KARAM CHAND BHARDWAJPetitioner
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA & ORSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mazlish Khan, Advocate and
Mr. Vikrant Koundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurabh Girdhar, Asstt.A.G., Haryana.

None for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Anil Chawla, Advocate
for respondents No.5 and 6.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J (Oral):

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a writ in the nature of *Certiorari* for quashing the impugned final result dated 12.08.2018 (Annexure P-7), whereby the benefit of experience for the post of Grid Sub Station Operator was denied. The petitioner further seeks a direction to the respondents to appoint the petitioner on the said post as he fulfills the requisite qualifications and experience in terms of the advertisement (Annexure P-1), and to keep one post vacant in reserved quota for him and to revise the final result.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the respondent-Commission had issued an advertisement (Annexure P-1) for filling up various posts including the post of Grid Sub-Station Operator.

Since the petitioner was fulfilling the requisite qualification and



experience, he applied for the aforesaid post, and submitted an experience certificate (Annexure P-6) in terms of the advertisement. The respondent-Corporation, while issuing the experience certificate, certified that the petitioner had served and acquired the requisite experience as Sub Station Attendant. However, respondent No.6, while issuing the certificate to the petitioner, inadvertently described SSA as Senior Shift Attendant. The aforesaid position was clarified by the affidavit filed on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 in terms of the order passed by this Court on 03.09.2024. The following order was passed:

“Additional affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent No.1 in CWP-7235-2019 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

Copy has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner in CWP-7235-2019, who seeks time to go through the same.

The State of Haryana especially the Haryana Staff Selection Commission and HVPNL shall file their specific affidavits to clarify as to what is the full form of the abbreviation SSA and how different full forms are being used in various cases.

On his request, adjourned to 14.11.2024.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies upon the judgment passed by this Court in CWP-21254-2018 titled as ***Rajender Kumar v. State of Haryana and others***, decided on 21.02.2023 along with one another case i.e. CWP-26291-2018 and CWP-35357-2019 decided on 21.02.2023 titled as ***Hariom v. State of Haryana and others*** decided on 31.01.2024. As such, the petitioner is entitled to the same relief as has been extended by this Court in the aforesaid judgments.

4. An affidavit dated 12.03.2025 of Kapil Grover, Under



Secretary, Haryana Staff Selection Commission, Panchkula, on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3, has been filed in the Court today, which is taken on record. The relevant part of the affidavit reads as under:

“ That the present writ petition came up for hearing on 03.09.2024 before the Hon’ble Court and the Hon’ble Court was pleased to pass the order dated 03.09.2024. The relevant part of the order is reproduced as below:-

“Additional affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondent No.1 in CWP-7235-2019 in the Court today and the same is taken on record.

Copy has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioner in CWP-7235-2119, who seeks time to go through the same.

The State of Haryana especially the Haryana Staff Selection Commission and HVPNL shall file their specific affidavits to clarify as to what is the full form of the abbreviation SSA and how different full forms are being used in various cases”

2. That the abovementioned order dated 03.09.2024, it is submitted here that the respondent-Commission has used full form of abbreviation SSA as Sub Station Attendant in view of experience certificate appended by the petitioner (Annexure P-6). Further, the deponent-Commission has not presumed/perused the full form/abbreviation of SSA as Sub Station Attendant on its own but the same has specifically been mentioned in the experience certificate of petitioner itself. Further, the concerned Corporation i.e. HVPNL has also filed its affidavit dated 12.11.2024 wherein the corporation has stated in para No.7 that vide order No.362/Cadre dated 16.09.2003 had re-designated the post of SSA (Sub-Station Attendant) as Grid Sub-Station Operator (GSO) as per decision taken by the Board of Directors, HVPNL in its meeting held on 27.08.2003.



Therefore, it can be said that the terms GSO and SSA are being used interchangeably.

3. That, further it is pertinent to mention here that, this Hon’ble Court vide order dated 02.07.2024 also raised a query and directed to file an affidavit. The relevant part of order dated 02.07.2024 is reproduced as under:-

“This Court raised a query to the learned counsels for the respondents as to whether out of the total selected persons in the aforesaid category of Grid Sub Station Operator anybody has been granted the weightage of experience on the basis of his experience certificate as GSO in any power utility or not.

Learned counsels for the respondents have prayed for some time to verify the aforesaid and to file an affidavit in this regard.

Let affidavit be filed by the Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited as well as by the Haryana Staff Selection Commission separately.”

With regard to this, it is pertinent to mention here that as per record, out of total selected candidates for the post in question, 16 candidates have been selected as Grid Sub Station Operator on the basis of experience certificate as GSO/SSA (as in 2003 the SSA i.e. Sub Station Attendant was designated as GSO i.e. Grid Sub-Station Operator). The details of these candidates are as under:-

Sr. No.	Name & Roll No. of selected candidate on the basis of experience on the post of GSO/SSA
1.	Surender Kumar (Roll No.1305600127)
2.	Ravinder (Roll No. 1305600149)
3.	Sumit Singh (Roll No.1305600308)



4.	<i>Saleem (Roll No. 1305603346)</i>
5.	<i>Vikas (Roll No. 1305604531)</i>
6.	<i>Suresh Kumar (Roll No. 1305604755)</i>
7.	<i>Parveen Kumar (Roll No. 1305604895)</i>
8.	<i>Sandeep Kumar (Roll No.1305605902)</i>
9.	<i>Arun Kumar (Roll No.1305607260)</i>
10.	<i>Vivek Kumar (Roll No. 1305607393)</i>
11.	<i>Hissam Singh (Roll No.1305608677)</i>
12.	<i>Mohinder Pal (Roll No. 1305608850)</i>
13.	<i>Ritanshu (Roll No. 1305608884)</i>
14.	<i>Vikash (Roll No. 1305609564)</i>
15.	<i>Ram Lal (Roll No. 1305610189)</i>
16.	<i>Jitender (Roll No. 1305605641)</i>

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondents No.5 and 6 does not controvert the fact that the Board of Directors, in its meeting held on 27.08.2003, re-designated the post of SSA (Sub Station Attendant) as Grid Sub Station Operator. He is also not in a position to controvert the fact that the petitioner’s claim is covered by the judgment in **Rajender Kumar’s** case (*supra*).

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of. The respondents are directed to pass an appropriate/fresh order, considering the experience certificate of the petitioner in the light of the judgment rendered by this Court in **Rajender Kumar’s** case (*supra*).



7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

20.02.2026
monika

- 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes /No