

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

CWP No.2640 of 2015

Date of Decision.16.02.2015

Nitu Jindal

.....Petitioner

Versus

HVPNL and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Pankaj Jain, 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 has a grievance that over head lines are being laid in a zig zag manner to save the interest of the 4th respondent. If the petitioner has already approached the Deputy Commissioner, who has purported to have issued an order on 12.02.2015 stating that the re-alignment made is not proper, the remedy for any person who is aggrieved, shall be only before the authority constituted under the Telegraph Act and cannot be by means of writ petition. The 1st respondent will take appropriate instructions from the Deputy Commissioner and shall also state the justification. The petitioner will resort to a remedy before the Deputy Commissioner, who is seisin of the matter and secure a redressal. Till the final orders are passed approving of the re-alignment, the 1st respondent will not carry out the further operations. Any final order of re-alignment shall abide by the decision of the Deputy Commissioner after following the procedure laid

down as above.

2. The writ petition is disposed of with the above directions. The petitioner is entitled to joint issues with the authorities and then seek for appropriate redressal in the manner indicated above.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 16, 2015
Pankaj*