

PANKAJ KUMAR
2015.01.29 12:26

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CWP No.1370 of 2015
Date of Decision.28.01.2015**

Satish KumarPetitioner
Versus
UHBVNL and anotherRespondents

Present: Mr. A.K. Singh Goyat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner will engage the Corporation in communication by way of representation as contemplated under Regulation 37.2 and make out a case that it involved no theft and the Corporation will pass a final order of assessment if the objection is not accepted or will review its decision on the basis of objection if the representation given is found to be true. The writ remedy for theft of electricity when there is no procedural lapse cannot be sustained.

2. If there is any delay in filing the representation as contemplated under the relevant Regulation, the time taken by the petitioner in filing the writ petition and seeking orders may be considered for exclusion for a decision on merits. The writ petition is disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

**January 28, 2015
Pankaj***