



CWP-34124-2025 (O&M) -1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

(215-1)

CWP-34124-2025 (O&M)

Bhupinder Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

(215-2)

CWP-39749-2025

Narinder Singh Aulakh and others ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

Judgment Reserved on	Judgment Pronounced on	Judgment Uploaded on	Whether only the operative part of the judgment is pronounced	Whether the full judgment is pronounced
06.02.2026	28.04.2026	29.04.2026	No	Yes

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Manu K. Bhandari, Advocate,
Mr. Rohit Kataria, Advocate and
Mr. Bhairav Gautam, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s) in both cases.

Mr. Armaan Dahiya, AAG, Haryana,
for respondent No.1 in both cases.

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Udit Garg, Addl. A.G., Haryana and
Mr. Ritvik Garg, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 to 5 in both cases.

Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate for
Mr. P.S.Miglani, Advocate,
for respondent No.6 in both cases.

**CWP-34124-2025 (O&M)****-2-****SUVIR SEHGAL, J.**

(1) By way of this singular order, this Court proposes to dispose of both the above noted petitions as they involve common questions of law and facts. For the sake of convenience, factual position is being taken from CWP-34124-2025.

(2) This petition has been filed for issuance of a writ of certiorari for quashing order dated 14.10.2025, Annexure P-11, whereby respondent No.3 has rejected a request for alteration of approved route for installation of Loop-In Loop-out (LILO) of 220 kV transmission line from Hukmawali-Chormar, Sub Station to BBMB line. A further prayer has been made for a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the site plan, Annexure P-4, suggested by petitioner as it is shorter and economical.

(3) Pleaded case of petitioner is that he is an agriculturist of village Vedwala and owns an agricultural land. According to him, respondents have started the process of installation of transmission line and by connecting the main BBMB Hisar-Sirsa line. Specific grievance of petitioner is that instead of connecting the transmission line through tower TL-292, which according to petitioner is in the straight line and a shorter route, respondents have chosen to connect it through TL-295, thereby taking the transmission line close to populated area of the village. The foundation of the allegation is that respondent No.5, who was posted as Executive Engineer, has manipulated the route to save the land of his relative, respondent No.6. Reliance has been placed upon notification dated 10.07.2024, Annexure P-3, pertaining to compensation for damages for laying 66 kV and above overhead transmission lines as well as upon site plan, Annexure P-4, and jamabandis, Annexure P-5. Complaints and representations

**CWP-34124-2025 (O&M)****-3-**

have been submitted by petitioner, which have resulted in the passing of the impugned order dated 14.10.2025, Annexure P-11.

(4) Upon notice, writ petition has been contested by respondents No.2 to 5-HVPSNL by filing a short reply. It has been deposed that the project was conceptualized in the year 2018 in a joint meeting between the officials of HVPSNL as well as Rajasthan Rajya Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (RRVPSNL). A decision was taken on 23.05.2018, Annexure R-2/1, which was approved on 07.06.2018, Annexure R-2/2, that a portion of existing 132 kV line, that is, Towers No.295 to 307 are required to be converted into multi circuit tower transmission line. Notification dated 02.07.2019, Annexure R-2/3, was published in the Gazette as well as two newspapers, but no objections were received. A specific stand has been taken that after conducting a detailed survey by HARSAC, it was found that the proposed route was the best possible plan to connect the transmission lines. After approval, tender for erection of transmission line was floated. Respondent No.5 was given the additional charge of Executive Engineer, TS Division, Sirsa for the first time on 20.09.2022, much later after the final decision had been taken. The work was allotted to a private concern for erection of 61 towers out of which 46 towers have been erected.

(5) Having heard counsel for the parties and after perusing the paper-book, this Court is of the considered view that no case for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is made out. Relief sought by petitioner in substance is not merely for setting aside communication, Annexure P-11, but for judicial intervention in the approved transmission alignment with the route proposed by him. It may be stated that matters concerning technical alignment



of transmission lines, route optimization, tower location, right of way, safety concerns, population constraints and engineering feasibility are pre-dominantly within the domain of the competent technical authorities. This Court neither has an expertise nor the means to determine as to what would be the possible route for laying of the transmission lines. Notification dated 10.07.2024, Annexure P-3, does not advance the case of petitioner as it provides for determination of compensation for Right of Way and for damage to crops and diminution in value of land due to installation of transmission lines of 66 kV and above.

(6) In so far as the allegation of malafide against respondent No.5 is concerned, it stands established on the record that respondent No.5 was neither posted at the Sub-Station concerned, nor was he involved in the preparation of the plans. He was given the charge of Executive Engineer, TS Division, Sirsa for the first time in September, 2022, by which time most of the decisions regarding the project had already been taken and were in the process of being implemented. Petitioner has not been able to establish the malafides with specificity or refer to any clear cogent and convincing material. Mere reliance upon the site plan or revenue entries and relationship with respondent No.6, would not establish the malafides alleged by petitioner. Allegations being unsubstantiated, stand rejected. The argument of the counsel on basis of Section 67(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 also does not persuade this Court to intervene. No material has been shown to support as to whether any specific statutory rule, executive instruction or procedure has been breached, which

**CWP-34124-2025 (O&M)****-5-**

would vitiate the approved route line. In the absence of any violation of mandatory procedural requirement, the argument is too broad, to support the relief claimed. Challenge to order, Annexure P-11, on the ground that it is non-speaking would not help the petitioner. Order, Annexure P-11, is a merely communication to petitioner in response to various complaints and representations submitted by him. It is not in the nature of an administrative order, which is required to be supported with reasons. Rather by this impugned communication, HVPNL has requested the petitioner to cooperate with completion of the project and permit its execution.

(7) In the second writ petition (CWP-39749-2025), petitioners have also laid challenge to public notice dated 26.06.2019 as well as the Government notification dated 02.07.2019. The public notice and notification were issued way back in the year 2019, whereas the writ petition has been filed in 2025 after the project has substantially progressed through survey, tendering, award of work and advanced execution of the contract. A stray challenge to the public notice and notification after the project has moved far beyond the conceptualization cannot be entertained in exercise of equitable writ jurisdiction. It has been established on the record that no objections to the notification dated 02.07.2019 were ever raised by any of the affected parties, including petitioners. Therefore, the attempt of petitioners to challenge the said public notice and notification at this belated stage is rejected.

(8) Once the competent authority has finalized a route after technical processing, Court should be slow to unsettle the same, unless a clear case of illegality is made out. The route of the transmission line cannot be re-laid at the asking or whims and fancies of the petitioner, merely because the transmission



line would pass through his land. Direction sought for by petitioner cannot be issued in the absence of any compelling material showing manifest, arbitrariness or statutory infraction. Writ jurisdiction is meant to examine the legality of decision making process not to choose between different available options. This Court is of the firm view that no case for intervention is made out.

- (9) For the afore-going reasons, both the writ petitions are dismissed, though with no order as to costs.
- (10) Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

28.04.2026
Kamal

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No