

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

CWP No.287 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision.05.02.2015

Rishi Pal

.....Petitioner

Versus

Director (V&S), HVPN, Panchkula and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. S.S. Momi, 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 given an objection to the notice served under Section 135 of the Electricity Act complaining of theft. The regulations require the objection to be taken and final assessment to be made based on the objections. The petitioner claims to have set forth the objections as per Annexure P-7. Annexure P-7 is directed to be decided within a week and the decision to be communicated to the petitioner. The petitioner may accompany with his request for consideration in the manner directed by this Court a copy of Annexure P-7 filed before the Court.

2. The counsel for the petitioner says that the petitioner is prepared to deposit 50% of the amount as claimed. If 50% of the amount as claimed is deposited, the restoration of connection shall be made and an order be passed making a final assessment on the basis of objections.

The issue of whether he will enjoy the benefit of service connection or

not will abide by the ultimate decision taken on the objections.

3. The writ petition is disposed of with the above directions.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 05, 2015
Pankaj*