



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No.1677 of 2026

07th July, 2026

THDC Diploma Engineers
Association and anotherPetitioners

Versus

Union of India and anotherRespondents

Presence:-

Mr. V.B.S. Negi, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Azmeen Wason, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Manoj Kumar, learned C.G.S.C. for the Union of India/respondent no.1.

Mr. Shobhit Saharia, learned counsel for respondent no.2.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

By means of this writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the Letter/Order No.14-7/12/2024-H.1 dated 11.06.2026, annexure no.1 to the writ petition, passed by respondent no.1 and further a direction in the nature of mandamus to the respondent no.1-Union of India to protect the employment interest of the permanent employees of respondent no.2 after disinvestment of its shareholding in respondent no.2.

2. Learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners submits that in the year 2020 75% shares of the respondent no.1-Union of India in THDC was transferred to NTPC; now in the year 2026 the Board of Directors of THDCIL and NEEPCO was restructured vide impugned order dated 11.06.2026. By restructuring the Board of Directors of THDC and NEEPCO, the petitioner are apprehending certain change in the terms and conditions of their services; three posts of Director e.g., Director (Technical), Director (Personal) and Director (Finance) have been abolished in the restructuring.



3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent no.1 and THDC submits that there is no whisper in the order impugned dated 11.06.2026 which in any manner going to effect the terms and conditions of service of the petitioners and its members; he further emphasized that the share of respondent no.1-Union of India in THDC were transferred to NTPC way back in the year 2020 and since then terms and conditions of service of the members of the petitioner-Association has never been disturbed/changed to their prejudice.

4. Merely on apprehension the writ petition cannot lie.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds substance in the submission of learned counsel for the respondent(s).

6. The impugned order nowhere whispers about any change in the terms and conditions of service of the members of the Petitioner-Association and therefore merely on an apprehension writ petition cannot be filed.

7. Accordingly this Court feels that no interference is required; the writ petition is totally misconceived and the same is dismissed *in limine*.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
07.07.2026

SK