



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

**CWP No. 22923-2026 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.08.2026**

Vasant Hurmade and ors.

....Petitioners

versus

NHPC Ltd and ors.

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Sreenath A. Khemka, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Satyapal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General assisted by
Mr. Sukhandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Ms. Archana Vashishth, Advocate for
Mr. Gaurav Pathak, Advocate
for respondent No. 3

* * *

SUDEEPTI SHARMA , J. (Oral)

1. Mr. Sukhandeep Singh, Advocate puts in appearance and filed his Vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No. 1 and 2-NHPC. The same is taken on record.

2. The present writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ seeking:

“A. Writ of Certiorari against the Amended Clause 6.2 of Promotion Policy dated 14.02.2025 (Annexure P-1), whereby arbitrary and unbridled powers have been conferred upon the CMD to bifurcate the unified and homogenous post of Executive Director in Grade E9 in the Technical Cadre, by giving undue preference to a particular discipline/ branch of engineering, without any prescribed ratio being

laid down by the Board.

B. Writ of Certiorari against the Circular dated 20.07.2026 (Annexure P-5) to the extent that the Petitioners were not shortlisted for Interviews for promotion to the post of Executive Director in Grade E9, despite their juniors being shortlisted.

AND

C. Writ of Mandamus directing that an appropriate ratio between disciplines/ branches of engineering be laid down by the Board, to regulate the arbitrary exercise of discretion by the CMD under the Amended Clause 6.2 of Promotion Policy dated 14.02.2025 (Annexure P-1).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present writ petition qua prayer clause No. B has become infructuous and be dismissed as such. However, he wishes to file a fresh writ petition with better particulars qua prayer clause Nos. A and C, in accordance with law, therefore prays that liberty be granted for the same.

4. In view of the same, the present petition is dismissed as having become rendered infructuous qua prayer clause No. B and the present writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn qua prayer clause Nos. A and C with the liberty afore-stated.

5. Pending application (s) if any also stands disposed of.

August 07, 2026
Gaurav Arora

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>