

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.7563 of 2013

=====

Nabisa Khatoon, Widow of Late Seikh Rasul, Resident of Village- Seikha Tola,
Ekamba, Post Office- Ekamba, Police Station- Cheria Bariarpur, District- Begusarai
.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Secretary-Cum-Commissioner, Energy Department,
Patna
 2. The Bihar State Electricity Board through its Chairman, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey
Road, Patna, Bihar
 3. The Executive Engineer (Transmission Line) Bihar State Electricity Board,
Power House Road, District Begusarai, Bihar
 4. The Sub Divisional Officer (Transmission Line) Bihar State Electricity Board,
at and P.O.- Manjhaul, District- Begusarai, Bihar
 5. The Junior Engineer (Transmission Line) Bihar State Electricity Board, At and
P.O.- Manjhaul, District- Begusarai, Bihar. Respondents
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Prakash Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 12-08-2015

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned counsel appearing for erstwhile Bihar State Electricity Board
(now Power Holding Company Ltd.).

2. The petitioner seeks compensation of
Rs.10,00,000/- (Ten lacs), as her husband died on account of
electrocution due to negligence of the authorities of the Power
Holding Company Ltd.

3. The case of the petitioner is that on 25.04.2009 at
4:00 AM her late husband, namely, Seikh Rasul, while going towards
his maize field came into contact with High Tension (11,000 volt) his

village came in contact with electric wire, which had snapped and laid unattended in the field. The snapped live wire was neither taken care of by the Department nor any device was installed to ensure stoppage of flow of the high voltage current.

4. On the application of the petitioner, the police registered UD Case No. 01 of 2009. The post-mortem report confirmed that her husband died due to electrocution. The death certificate issued by the Gram Panchayat was also to the same effect.

5. Counsel for the Board submits that a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (One lac) was paid to the petitioner long time back. On the other hand, the petitioner contended that the sum paid is inadequate, as she does not have any source of income and her husband, who died in his forties, has left behind two minor children.

6. Having regard to the facts of the case, the writ application is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Human Rights Commission with respect to further compensation.

7. With the aforesaid observation, this application stands disposed of.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--