



HPGCL

HARYANA POWER GENERATION CORPORATION LIMITED

Regd. Office: C-7, URJA BHAWAN, SECTOR-6, PANCHKULA.

Corporate Identity Number:- U45207HR1997SGC033517

website: www.hpgcl.org.in
Telephone No.0172-5023425Email: dsgenl@hpgcl.org.in

Office Order No. 43 /CE/Admn.

Dated: 08/05/2020

The petitioners approached the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court by way of filing CWP No. 35609 of 2019 titled as Surinder Kumar & Others Vs State of Haryana with the prayer for restoring the benefits of Adhoc relief to the petitioners No. 5 to 8 relying upon the judgment dated 11.08.2003 of the Hon'ble High Court passed In CWP No. 4518 of 2000, judgment dated 27.07.2000 passed in CWP No. 16084 of 1997 and judgment dated 08.12.2015 of Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in Civil Appeal No. 8661 of 2009.

The Civil Writ Petition No. 35609 of 2019 was fixed for hearing before the Hon'ble court on 9.12.2019 and the Hon'ble High Court was pleased to pass the following orders:-

"The present writ petition has been filed seeking restoration of Ad-hoc Relief, which was granted to the petitioners by Government of Haryana.

In support of the claim, the petitioners are relying upon the judgment of this Court passed in CWP No. 4518 of 2000 dated 11.8.2003 (Annexure-P-4) and judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court passed in Civil Appeal No. 8661 of 2009 dated 8.12.2015 (Annexure-P-5).

For the relief, which has been claimed in the present writ petition, the petitioners have served the respondents with a legal notice dated 14.03.2019 (Annexure-P-7), which is still pending consideration with the respondents and the petitioners will be satisfied, at this stage, in case a time bound direction is issued to the respondents to decide the said legal notice by passing an appropriate speaking order.

Without commenting upon the merits of the case or about the entitlement of the petitioners for the relief which has been claimed by them in the legal notice dated 14.03.2019 (Annexure-P-7), the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the legal notice dated 14.03.2019 (Annexure-P-7) within a period of three months from the receipt of certified copy of this order."

In view of the above orders of the Hon'ble Court, the record related to the petitioners No. 5 to 8 of HPGCL was examined and it was found that the petitioners were appointed in erstwhile HSEB. HPGCL came to existence on 14 August, 1998 after unbundling of erstwhile HSEB into Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (HVPNL) and Haryana Power Generation Corporation Limited (HPGCL) by virtue of Haryana Electricity Reforms at 1997 . Accordingly, the following 04 no. petitioners who were allocated in HPGCL as a consequence of unbundling, retire from HPGCL as tabulated below:-

Sr. No.	Name of the Petitioner
1	J.K.Jain S/o Budh Sain Jain (Retired as UDC)
2	Jawahar Lal S/o Tara Chand (Retired as Storekeeper)
3	Subhash Chander Atreja (Retired as Section Officer)
4	Narender Kumar Jain S/o Raghunath Sahai Jain (Retired as AE)

Whereas, petitioners have claimed for re-fixation of their pay/pension w.e.f 01.04.1979 with all consequential benefits in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble High Court in CWP No. 4518 of 2000 which were upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 08.12.2015 in Civil Appeal No. 8661 of 2009.

Whereas, the Govt. of Haryana had decided to grant Adhoc relief to its employees at varying rates vide Finance Department letter No. 3608-3FR-72/21099 dated 27/29-06-1972 w.e.f 01.4.1972 in the shape of "First component of Adhoc Relief" ranging between Rs. 15 /- to Rs. 45/- and second component of Adhoc relief ranging between Rs. 7/- to Rs. 15/- per rates indicated in the table below:-

Pay Range	1st component of Adhoc relief	Second component of Adhoc relief
Below Rs. 85/-	Rs. 15/- per month	Rs. 07/- per month
Rs. 85/- to Rs. 209/-	Rs. 25/- per month	Rs. 08/- per month
Rs. 210/- to 499/-	Rs. 30/- per month	Rs. 10/- per month
Rs. 500/- to 1250/-	Rs. 45/- per month	Rs. 15/- per month

It is pertinent to mention here that the third installment of Adhoc Relief was released w.e.f. 01.12.1972, vide Finance Department letter No. 7158-3FR-72/30420 dated 19.12.1972 ranging between Rs. 7/- to 10/- as per rates indicated in the table below :-

Pay Range	Amount of additional Adhoc relief
Below Rs. 85/-	Rs. 07/- per month
Rs. 85/- to Rs. 209/-	Rs. 08/- per month
Rs. 210/- to 574/-	Rs. 10/- per month

Whereas, it is worthwhile to mention here that the Govt. of Haryana was considering grant of Regular Additional Dearness Allowance to its employees. In this regard the State Govt. vide Finance Department letter No. 1699-3FR-74/10392 dated 20.03.1974 granted Additional Dearness Allowance to its employees, belonging to the Class-II, III and IV service w.e.f. 01.05.1973, 01.08.1973, 01.10.1973 and 01.01.1974 on every 8 points increase in the Consumer Price index. The rates of Additional Dearness Allowances are indicated in the table below:-

Period for which payable	Range of emoluments	Rate of additional Dearness Allowance per month
(i) 1.5.1973 to 21.7.1973	Upto Rs. 300/- (Emolument as defined in para 2 below	4% of emoluments
	Above Rs. 300/- and upto Rs. 900 (Emolument as defined in para 2 below	3% of emolument subject to a minimum of Rs. 12/- p.m. and a of Rs. 27/- p.m. (and subject to marginal adjustment so that the emolument plus additional. dearness allowed does not exceed Rs. 927/-)
(ii) 1.8.1973 to 30.09.1973	Up to 300/-	8% of emoluments
	Above Rs. 300/- and upto Rs. 1200/-	6 % of emolument subject to a minimum of Rs. 24/- P.M and maximum of Rs.54/- P.M.
(iii) 1.10.1973 to 31.12.1973	Upto Rs. 300/-	12% of emoluments
	Above Rs. 300/- and upto Rs. 1200/-	9% of emoluments subject to a minimum of Rs. 36/- p.m and maximum of Rs. 81/- p.m.
(iv) 1.1.1974 onwards	Upto Rs. 300/-	16 % of emoluments
	Above Rs. 300/- not exceeding Rs. 900/-	12% of emoluments minimum of Rs. 48/- p.m. and maximum of Rs. 108/- p.m
	Above Rs. 900/- and upto Rs. 926/-	Marginal adjustment so that the emolument plus, additional Dearness Allowance does not exceed Rs. 1008/-
	Rs. 972/- and above, upto Rs. 1200/-	Rs. 81/-p.m.

The adhoc reliefs were granted without adopting any formula with reference to cost of living. While calculating Additional Dearness Allowance, the adhoc relief given earlier on a slab system without reference to any formula was found to be higher than what was permissible on the basis of Consumer Price Index formula. On the basis of calculations, it was found that the Dearness Allowance granted by way of adhoc relief was in excess to the extent of Rs. 9.40 to Rs. 45/- in various categories of pay slab when compared with the admissible allowance as per Consumer Price Index. As principle, it was not considered desirable to reduce the emoluments or to recover the excess amount drawn by the employees. Hence, it was decided that the Additional Dearness Allowance would only accrue after the adjustment of the excess adhoc relief already granted. Therefore, it was provided in Para-3 of the above-said letter-dated 20.03.1974 of Finance Department that a part of the amount of adhoc relief, as indicated in column 5 and 7 of Annexure-1 of said letter, was to be adjusted in the Additional Dearness Allowance.

Subsequently, Haryana Government vide Notification No. GSR.20/Const /Art.309/80 dated 29.02.1980 had revised the pay scale of its employees w.e.f 01.04.1979 wherein it was provided that the above-said excess amount of Adhoc Relief was to be deducted while fixing pay of the Employees in the revised pay scale.

Whereas, the order dated 20.03.1974, was challenged by some employees by filing a Civil Writ Petition No. 966 of 1988, titled as Haryana College Teachers Association, Panchkula and others Versus State of Haryana and others wherein the Hon'ble High Court (as decided on 18.07.1988) had held that the deduction of respective amount per month (as per condition No. 3 of the Govt. order date 20.03.1974) from the emoluments of the petitioners i.e. Haryana College Teachers Association was illegal and had directed to refund the amount deducted in pursuant to the stipulation as mentioned in the Govt. order. It is very significant to mentioned here that the adjustment of adhoc relief deduction in the case of Haryana College Teachers Associations' case (CWP No. 966 of 1988) by the Govt. was wholly unjustified because of the fact that the petitioners of CWP No. 966 of 1988) were not the recipients/beneficiaries for the grant of any adhoc relief under the Govt. of Haryana's order dated 19th December, 1972. Accordingly as a natural corollary to that, in their case, the question of adjustment of excess payment/excess additional relief of the amount of adhoc relief did not arise at all and this Hon'ble High Court was justified on striking down the condition of deduction/adjustment as provided in the above mentioned Govt. order dated 20.03.1974, qua College Lecturers only.

Whereas, after the decision of Haryana College Teachers Association's case, another CWP No. 5563-A of 1989-titled Nitya Nand and others Vs State of Haryana and others was filed in the Hon'ble High Court by challenging validity of the Govt. order dated 20.03.1974 pertaining stipulations 3 and 4 of the said order. The Hon'ble High Court relying upon its earlier decision in Haryana College Teachers Association Panchkula and others Vs State of Haryana and another (CWP No. 966 of 1988) disposed of the CWP No. 5563-A of 1939 dated 23.04.1990 on the same terms. However, the facts remain that the petitioners in the Nitya Nand's case were actually the recipient/beneficiary of the benefit of adhoc relief as granted by the Finance Department letter dated in 27/29.06.1972 & 19.12.1972, whereas the petitioners of the Haryana College Teachers Association's case were not actual beneficiaries. Facts were not identical in these two cases, in fact, the case of Haryana College Teachers Association's turned on its own special facts as mentioned above, therefore, an analogy could not be drawn with the fact of Nitya

Nand's case. Thus Nitya Nand's case was wrongly decided by wrongly applying the reasoning of college Lecturers case.

Nitya Nand's case was subsequently duly considered by the Hon'ble Division Bench in CWP No. 16470 of 1990 on 18.09.1991 & was distinguished. Operative part of judgment is reproduced as under:-

"It is also relevant to mentioned that the case of college Lecturer Association had been decided by G.C. Mittal (as his Lordship then was). In spite of that decision and in spite of judgment in Nitya Nand's case having been placed before their Lordship, the Motion Bench considered it appropriate on February 5, 1991 to direct the petitioners to make a representation and the respondents to pass a speaking order. Therefore, a detailed order has come on record, which was not available to the bench in Nitya Nand case. In view of the detailed position as disclosed in this order, the necessity of referring the matter to a large Bench is obviated.

It is note-worthy that in Nitya Nand's case even the objection regarding delay had not been raised. In the present case, the learned Advocate General has vehemently contended that decision of State Government of 1974 have been challenged in the year 1990. On consideration of the matter, we find merit in the objection. The petitioners did not raise even a whisper against the order of March, 1974 during all these years. In fact, they draw all the benefits under the order which is now sought to be impugned. Not only that the pay scales have been revised in the year 1979 and 1986, but even otherwise, we have found no justification for the long silence on the part of the petitioner. On the ground of delay alone the petition deserves to be dismissed. The learned counsel for the petitioners contend that it is a recurring cause of action. We are not inclined to accept this contention. The pay of every employee had been fixed in accordance with the letter of March 20, 1974 and the Annexure thereto. Even a suit would be totally barred by limitation. In such a situation we are not inclined to invoke our extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to entertain this belated claim made by the petitioners.

Accordingly, we find no merit in those petitions which are hereby dismissed. In the circumstances of the case, we leave the parties to bear their own costs."
Dated: 18.9.1991.

Along with the above stated writ petition about 268 writ petitions were decided and the above stated decision was challenged by the employees by filling SLPs in the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) 20144 of 1991 and SLP (C) 8878-81 of 1992 decided on 17.02.1993, reported as 1993(2) SLR 27 titled as State of Haryana & Others Vs. O.P.Sharma & Others had distinguished the decision in Nitya Nand's case and upheld the decision of the Government & also justified the decision in college Lecturer's case.

Whereas, subsequent to above decision/judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court & High Court, various writ petitions had been filed on the above mentioned issue by other employees of the State Govt and most of these writ petitions were allowed on the basis of the decision in Nitya Nand's case, in ignorance of the decision dated 18.09.1991 in CWP No. 16470/1990 as upheld by Hon'ble Supreme Court reported as 1993 (2) SLR 27. A CWP No. 13300 of 1990, titled as Daya Ram Yadav and others Vs State of Haryana and others was decided by the Hon'ble High Court in the following terms:-

"For the reasons in CWP No. 5563-A of 1989 (Nitya Nand V/s State of Haryana) decided on 23.04.1990, the writ petition is allowed and is disposed of in the same terms and with the same order and conditions."

Whereas, CWP No. 16084 of 1997-titled as Dharampal Singh Vs. State of Haryana and others and CWP No. 2757 of 1998-titled as Diwan Chand Vs State of Haryana and others, were filed on the same issue, and both these CWPs were disposed off by a common order dated 27.7.2000, by Hon'ble Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court on the basis of decision of CWP No. 13300 of 1990 in the same terms by ignoring the earlier decision dated 18.9.1991 in CWP

No. 16470 of 1990 vide which 268 writ petition were dismissed on the ground of delay as well as on merits, which decision was upheld by Hon'ble Supreme Court in 1993(2) SLR 27.

Whereas, another group of Govt. employees had filed CWP No. 4518 of 2000-titled as R.K.Gupta and others Vs State of Haryana and others, on the same identical issue. The Hon'ble High Court relied upon the earlier judgment passed in CWP No. 16084 of 1997 and allowed the CWP No. 4518 of 2000, on the same terms. Aggrieved with the order passed in CWP No. 4518 of 2000, the State of Haryana filed a Civil Appeal No. 8661 of 2009. The Hon'ble Apex Court dismissed the Civil Appeal on the basis of earlier, SLP (C) No. 2578 of 1996 decided on 09.05.1997 which was dismissed on ground of delay and Civil Appeal No. 923 of 1992 titled as State of Haryana and others Vs Om Parkash and other, however while passing the order in CA No. 8661/2009 duly noticed the earlier decision reported as 1993 (2) SLR 27 by observing that Hon'ble Supreme Court already decided the controversy, a decision which is in favour of the Government.

Whereas, now the petitioners have based their claims on the basis of the decision of the Hon'ble High Court rendered in CWP No. 16084/1997, 2757/1998 and CWP No. 4518 of 2000.

Even the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court now relied by the petitioner s against the petitioners as the Civil Appeal No. 8661 of 2000 has been disposed of on the basis of decision 193 (2) SLR (27) which is in favour of the department.

Whereas, it is pertinent to mention that some other writ petitions were also filed in the Hon'ble High Court titled as Om Parkash Kaushik and others Vs. State of Haryana and others, Mohar Singh and others Vs. State of Haryana and other, Jasram Singh and other V/s State of Haryana and Others, in which the Hon'ble Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court categorically differentiated ratio of the Haryana College Teachers Association's case (CWP No. 966 of 1988) and Nitya Nand's case (CWP No. 5563-A of 1989) and held that the case of Haryana College Teachers Associations' case could not have been treated as an authority or an analogy for deciding the case of other Government servants like Nitya Nand who had in fact received the benefits of adhoc interim relief under the Finance Departments orders 27/29.06.1972 & 19.12.1972. This Hon'ble High Court, did not consider the Haryana College Teachers Association's case and Nitya Nand's case as binding precedents to be followed in the above mentioned batch of writ petitions, decided on 18.09.1991 where this Hon'ble High Court had dismissed the writ petitions, upholding the Govt. order of 20.03.1974. Relevant extract of the order dated 18.09.1991 is already reproduced in the preceding para.

Whereas, aggrieved with the order of the Hon'ble Court, the petitioners had filed the Special Leave Petition No. 8878-81 of 1992, 3399 of 1993 and 3400 of 1993 against upholding the Govt. order dated 20.03.1974 and the same were dismissed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 17.02.1993 while deciding the case State of Haryana and another Vs. O.P. Sharma and Ors. and connected Civil appeals No. 53-60 of 1992 reported as 1993 (2) SLR 27 & upheld the action of the Government in adjustment of the excess adhoc relief while fixing the pay in the revised pay fixation. The decision in Nitya Nand's case was based on the decision in the College Teacher's case without realizing that Nitya Nand and other Government Servants had in fact been the beneficiaries of the interim relief granted in 1972 unlike the College Teachers. No other reason was given in Nitya Nand's case. When the other batch of cases came up before another Division Bench the college Teacher's case. It was realized that the factual position was

not identical and therefore the petitioners were directed to make a comprehensive representation to the State Government for its consideration. The State Government was also directed to dispose of the said representation by a speaking order. When the order giving reasons for negating the contention of the employees was placed before the Division Bench it appreciated the stand of the State Government since the factual premise in the case of College Teachers was altogether different from the factual premise in the case of other Government employees who had actually received the adhoc interim relief, the High Court, therefore, rightly came to the conclusion that the ratio of the College Teachers case was not applicable to the case of those Government Servants who were the recipients of adhoc interim relief. Since, the interim granted in 1972 was not based on any formula but was totally adhoc, when the formula for the grant of additional dearness allowance of the cycle of increase by points in the Consumer Price index was adopted by the State Government, the State Government realized the adhoc interim relief was in excess by Rs. 9.40 to Rs. 45/- per month depending on the pay slab of a Government servant and, therefore, decided to adjust the increase of a Government servant and, therefore, decided to adjust the increase rather than order of lump sum recovery of the excess amount. Such an order passed by the State Government to recover the excess amount in a phased manner can never be termed as arbitrary, unreasonable, unfair or illegal. The High Court was therefore, right in refusing to follow the decision in Nitya Nand's case in the subsequent writ petitions which were filed by various groups of Government employees who had benefited from interim adhoc relief and also rejected the claim being suffered from delay & laches apart from merits. The SLP filed by the employees against the subsequent order of the High Court upholding the impugned order of 20th March, 1974 must fall and were rejected. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case State of Haryana Vs. O.P Sharma and others, 1993 (2) SLR 27 had categorically upheld the validity of the Govt. order dated 20.03.1974 and the stipulations as mentioned in the said order was also held to be legal and proper and held that the order of the Govt. to recover the excess amount in a phased manner can never be termed as arbitrary, unreasonable, unfair or illegal.

Whereas, the adhoc relief as granted by the Govt. of Haryana and others in 1972, was adhoc, pure and simple and there was no legal or vested right to get a particular quantum of dearness allowances. This adhoc relief were granted in year 1972 without adopting formula with reference to the cost of living and by the Govt. order dated 20.03.1974 the Additional Dearness Allowance was granted on every 8 points increase in the Consumer Price Index Wherein this adhoc relief given earlier on the slab system without reference to any formula was found the Govt. on analysis to be higher than what was permissible on the basis of Consumer price Index Formula. It is to be further submitted that on the basis of analysis and meticulous calculations, it was found that the dearness allowance granted by ways of adhoc relief was in excess to the extent of Rs. 9.40 to Rs. 45 in various categories of pay slabs when compared with the admissible dearness allowance as per Consumer Price Index. As a principle, it was not considered desirable to reduce the emoluments or to recover the excess amount drawn by the employees. Therefore, it was decided that the additional dearness allowance would only accrue after the adjustment of the excess adhoc relief already granted. Whereas, the Govt. was well within its right to adjust the excess amount drawn by the Government employees. Towards future installments of additional dearness allowance and such adjustment under stipulation No. 3 of Govt. order 20.03.1974, could not be ruled as unfair and arbitrary or in violation of law and further cannot be turned as violation


of natural justice of the Government employees. Hence, the present petitioner is not entitled to the claimed relief in view of the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court reported as 1993 (2) SLR 27.

Apart from merits, the petitioners present claim for re-fixation of their pay/pension w.e.f 01.04.1979 after 40 years which is highly time barred and beyond any logic or justification. No financial or civil right can be claimed after 3 years. More so when the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court dismissed the claim in CWP No. 16470 of 1990- Ishwar Singh Sharma & Others Vs. State of Haryana & Others decided on 18.09.1991 on merits as well as on delay in the year 1991 itself, as per the operative part of the order re-produced in the preceding para.

Further, as per the decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported as (2008) 10 SCC 115; 2013(6) SLR 629; 2011 (4) SCC 374, decision of Hon'ble High Court in LPA No. 740 of 2015 (O&M) by taking the plea that as stated above petitioner is not entitled to any relief on merits as well as belated and stale claim cannot be accepted after a delay of more than 4 decades. Even though certain employees have been granted relief by the Hon'ble High Court in the year 2000 as upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 08.12.2015 and arrears of amount confined to only 38 months prior to filling of the writ petitions which were filed in the year 1997, 1988 and 2000 respectively and getting a direction from the Hon'ble High Court to decide the legal notice does not provide fresh cause of action of a time barred stale claim. The claim which the petitioners now claimed in the year 2018-19 by serving a legal notice, the actual cause of action arose in the year 1973-74. Adhoc interim relief granted already deducted/adjusted amount gives only a right to recovery and the limitation to recover the amount deducted/adjusted is three years, which lapses way back in the year 1976-77. The petitioners cannot be extended the benefit of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 08.12.2015 as stated in the preceding paras on account of parity with other employees of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble High Court in the year 2000 & 2003.

Here in the present cases also, the cause of action arose during the year 1973-74 and the petitioners have challenged the said action after more than 4 decade. Further, **while deciding SLP (C) No. 20144 of 1991-State of Haryana and another V/s O.P. Sharma & another**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its order dated 17.02.1993 held that the action of the State Government in either recovery or adjustment of interim adhoc relief does not suffer any illegality, arbitrariness or discrimination, Hence, the benefit of restoration of a part of the amount of adhoc relief which was deducted while fixation of pay w.e.f 01.04.1979 as claimed in the legal notice dated **14.03.2019** cannot be extended to the petitioner keeping in view the position narrated above. Thus, the claim of the petitioners is rejected on merits as well as a stale claim suffers from delay & laches.

I order accordingly in compliance of directions dated 9.12.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court in **CWP No. 35609 of 2019** titled as Surinder Kumar & Others Vs State of Haryana.



Dy. Secy./Genl.,
for Chief Engineer/Admn.,
HPGCL, Panchkula.

Endst. No. CK 17 | HPGCL-CB551-(I)/3294

Dated:- 08/05/2020

A copy of above is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action:-

1. Additional Chief Secretary to Govt. of Haryana, Finance Deptt., Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.
2. Additional Chief Secretary to Govt. of Haryana, Power Deptt., Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh w.r.t. his office memo no.26/1/2020-4 Power dated 08.01.2020.
3. Dy. Secretary/Finance, FD. Govt. of Haryana Civil Secretariat, Chandigarh.
4. LR, HPUs, Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula.
5. Controller of Finance, HPGCL, Panchkula.
6. Chief Engineer/PTPS, RGTPP, DCRTTP, HPGCL.
7. Chief Accounts Officer, HPGCL, Panchkula.
8. Dy. Secy./Estt., (G), HPGCL, Panchkula.
9. XEN/IT, HPGCL, Panchkula. It is requested to host the speaking order on the website of HPGCL.
10. Nodal Officer-cum-Under Secretary/NGE, HPGCL, Panchkula w.r.t. his office memo no.192/Ch.16/HPGC/C/HPU/2020 dated 28.01.2020.
11. Under Secy./Estt.(NGE), HPGCL, Panchkula.
12. Sh. J.K. Jain s/o Budh Sain Jain (UDC Retd.), R/o House No. 16-B, Model Town Enclave, Panipat.
13. Sh. Jawahar Lal s/o Tara Chand (Storekeeper Retd.) R/o House no.34, Parkash Nagar, Tehsil Town Panipat.
14. Sh. Subhash Chander Atreja S/o Kishan Chand (Section Officer Retd.) R/o House no.629, Sector-18, HUDA, Near Toll Plaza, Panipat.
15. Sh. Narender Kumar Jain S/o Raghunath Sahai Jain (AE Retd.) R/o H. No.1729, Sector-12, HUDA, Panipat

Dy. Secy./Genl.,
for Chief Engineer/Admn.,
PGCL, Panchkula.

CC:-

1. SPS to Managing Director, HPGCL, Panchkula.
2. PS to Chief Engineer/Admn., HPGCL, Panchkula.