

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

CWP No.1601 of 2015

Date of Decision.30.01.2015

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited

.....Petitioner

Versus

Subhash and another

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Pardeep Singh Poonia, 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. There is no scope for intervention to the order passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat where it found the Nigam liable not merely for the value of the buffalo but also imposed an additional amount of ₹ 50,000/- for harassment caused. It was a case of electrocution of a buffalo that came on contact with live electric wire. It typically answers a *res ipsa loquitur* situation and it will not be open for the Nigam to state that the buffalo is negligent. On the other hand, the negligence must always be cast on the Nigam which did not have a safety device put in place that should be provided for tripping of electricity, if any contact had been made by any human being or a living being. The Corporation that engaged a poor person in litigation unnecessarily without settling the claim was slapped with compensation for mental suffering also against the Nigam which I think is appropriate and just.

2. I do not find any scope for intervention in the writ petition.

The writ petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)  
JUDGE

January 30, 2015  
Pankaj\*