

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

**Review Application No.55 of 2015 in
Civil Writ Petition No.812 of 2015**

Date of decision:09.02.2015

Man Singh and another

... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate,
for the applicants/petitioners.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ? No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ? No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. There is already a direction that the petitioner could have only an objection by way of representation to the authority who has served a notice alleging theft of electricity. The petitioner has wasted long number of years by resorting to procedure which are unacceptable. The counsel wants me to rely on some orders passed in yet another case which is not a final adjudication and I will not, therefore, find any reason to give the benefit of any discretion to the petitioner. The Corporation will consider the representation given by the petitioner against the allegation of theft and pass suitable orders in the manner contemplated under the Regulations. If the period for

**Review Application No.55 of 2015 in
Civil Writ Petition No.812 of 2015**

- 2 -

giving representation has already expired, the representation will be received in the manner that was already directed by this court within one week. It is the only modification which allow for consideration in the review, since no time is prescribed for consideration of representation. Such a decision shall be taken as expeditiously as possible. The petitioner will be heard on his objections, if he deposits ₹1 lakh at the time his application is presented setting out the objections for disconnection and for theft.

2. The review application is disposed of as above.

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**

09.02.2015
sanjeev