



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

136

**CWP-37865-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.12.2025**

Rajpal

....Petitioner

Versus

The Haryana State Electricity Board now Haryana Power General
Corporate Limited and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Mohnish Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this writ petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of a writ in the nature of *certiorari*, for quashing the impugned office order dated 27.04.2012 (Annexure P-4) passed by respondent No.3, whereby the claim of the petitioner for providing employment as per the Policy of the Board providing employment to one member of the family whose land has been acquired by the respondents has been rejected. Further a writ of *mandamus* has been sought, directing the respondents to consider and grant suitable employment to the petitioner or his son in terms of the applicable policy dated 07.04.1992 (Annexure P-1).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that the petitioner's family land measuring 21 Kanal 1 Marla, situated in



Village Assan Kalan, District Panipat, was acquired on 05.12.1985 for setting-up of the Panipat Thermal Power Project and pursuant thereto the Haryana State Electricity Board framed a Policy dated 07.04.1992 (Annexure P-1) providing appointment to one eligible member of each land-loser family. He further submits that the petitioner duly applied for the employment within the stipulated time, however, his claim was arbitrarily rejected whereas several other similarly situated land oustees were granted appointments under the said policy. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner approached this Court by filing CWP No.16243 of 1993, which was allowed vide judgment dated 29.06.2010 (Annexure P-2), and the intra-court appeal preferred by the respondents was also dismissed on 04.02.2011 (Annexure P-3). Despite the matter having attained finality, the respondents, instead of complying with the judicial directions, issued an office order dated 27.04.2012 (Annexure P-4) rejecting the petitioner's claim again on untenable and factually incorrect ground that his application had not been submitted before the cut-off date. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that the petitioner's case is squarely covered by the judgment passed by this Court in **RSA-379-1995**, titled as ***Haryana State Electricity Board and another vs Karam Singh*** (Annexure P-6), which has since been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 27.02.2025 (Annexure P-7). Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner submitted a detailed representation dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-8), which remained unheeded. The information obtained



under the RTI Act (Annexure P-9) clearly establishes that employment has been granted even to grandsons of land oustees in comparable cases. Learned counsel for the petitioner asserts that the continued denial of employment to the petitioner is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the representation dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.1 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents, appearing on advance notice, submits that he has no objection, in case a direction is issued to respondent No.1 for time-bound consideration and decision of the representation dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.1 is directed to consider the representation dated 24.03.2025 (Annexure P-8) of the petitioner and pass a speaking order in the light of the judgment rendered by this Court in ***Karam Singh's case (supra)***, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner. Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.1.



6. Disposed of, accordingly.
7. It is made clear that any deviation from the directions issued by this Court would entitle the petitioner to file an appropriate application under Article 215 of the Constitution of India for initiation of contempt proceedings against the respondents.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

22.12.2025
yakub

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