

2025:PHHC:063879-DB

CM-3895-LPA-2016,  
CM-3896-LPA-2016,  
CM-3897-LPA-2016 in/and  
LPA-1887-2016 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 14.05.2025

Phool Singh

...Appellant

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA**

Present: None for the appellant.  
Mr. Saurabh Mohunta, DAG, Haryana.  
Ms. Perna Malhotra, Advocate for  
Mr. Prateek Mahajan, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

\*\*\*

**SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J. (Oral)**

1. Counsel for the appellant is not present.
2. This is an old case pending since 2013 and we therefore, need not wait further for him.
3. Learned counsel appearing for respondents No.2 and 3/ Nigam submits that this Court vide order dated 05.05.2025, in LPA No.208 of 2017 and connected appeals, has finally adjudicated the controversy and held as under:-

*“14. We are unable to accept the contention. In Balbir Singh’s case (supra), the Division Bench while allowing the appeal noticed one factor, which needs to be taken note of:-*

*“In our considered opinion, it was open to the appellants to have contended at that point of time in that Writ Petition that the representation of the respondent cannot be entertained on the ground of laches, but they have*

*waived the said condition. Therefore, they are stopped from raising the said contention in this writ petition. Also, the said contention can be said to be barred by the principle of constructive resjudicata as well.”*

*15. We have also noticed that the selection process is of the year 1992, revised in the year 1995. In the years 1998 and 1999, the said State Electricity Board has already divided into 4 different companies. The posts were also assigned to four different companies. The advertisement has lost its life and has become otiose. After so many years, the candidates who had applied under the said advertisement would have now become 33 years older in age. Some of them may have attained the age of superannuation.*

*16. In view thereto, we find that this entire exercise of pursuing the appeal, which is being conducted at this belated stage, has become purely academic. That apart, on merit also, we do not find any reason to grant relief to the appellants who remained silent with regard to their claim for reserved posts till 2014 while the selection process had been started afresh in the year 1996. The learned Single Judge has, thus, rightly found the case to be suffered from gross delay and laches. The respondents have already taken the said objection and, therefore, the judgment of Balbir Singh’s case (supra) would have no application to the facts of the present case. Accordingly, we dismiss all the four appeals.”*

4. In view thereto, the present appeal is also dismissed.
5. All pending misc. application(s) also stand disposed of.

**(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)**  
**JUDGE**

14.05.2025

rajesh

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