

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

117

Civil Writ Petition No.2485 of 2015

Date of Decision: March 02, 2015

Sukhminder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

Present: Mr. Kanwalvir Singh Kang, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH, J. (ORAL)

It is the contention of the counsel for the petitioner that the daughter of the petitioner namely Mansimran Kaur died due to electrocution when she fell on the live wires outside House No.91-C, Bhai Randhir Singh Nagar, Ludhiana on 10.07.2013, which was negligently exposed and was a live wire. The liability is that of the Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, who are maintaining the said electricity connection and supplying power to the house. Petitioner has submitted a detailed representation dated 27.11.2014 (Annexure P-5) to the respondents but till date no response has been received. He contends that the claim of the petitioner is covered in his favour by the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in cases titled as **Raman Vs. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others 2015(1) R.C.R. (Civil) 353 and H.S.E.B. and others Vs. Ram Nath and others, 2005 ACJ 342 (SC)**, according to which the respondents are liable to compensate the petitioner for the negligence on their part, which has resulted in untimely and unfortunate death of petitioner's daughter. Counsel

states that the petitioner will be satisfied at this stage if time bound direction is issued to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 27.11.2014 and convey the decision thereon.

In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of with directions to the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner dated 27.11.2014 (Annexure P-5) within a period of two months from the date of receipt of certified copy of the order and convey the decision. In case the claim of the petitioner is accepted, the consequential benefits be released to him within a further period of one month. In case the petitioner is not satisfied with the decision taken by the respondent, it will be open to him to avail of the remedy in accordance with law.

March 02, 2015
Puneet

(AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH)
JUDGE