

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

WPC No. 1475 of 2015

Parmanand Kaushik S/o Late Ramphal Kaushik Aged About 53 Years R/o Village-
Belmundi, Post Sakarra, Thana- Hirri, Tah.- Takhatpur, Civil & Revenue District
Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through: Secretary, Department Of Revenue, New Mahanadi
Bhawan, Raipur, District Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Collector, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Sub Divisional Officer (R), Kota, Distt.- Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
4. Tahsildar, Sakri, Distt.- Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
5. Executive Engineer, (T & M) Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company
Limited, Tifra, Distt.- Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
6. Junior Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited,
Chakarbhata Camp, Distt.- Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)
7. General Manager, M/s Inspire Industries Private Limited Belmundi, Sakarra, Distt.-
Bilaspur, (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

Shri F.S.Khare, counsel for the petitioner/s.
Shri Ramakant Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/ respondents 1 to 4.
None for other respondents even in the second round.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

08/02/2016

In this case, earlier opportunities were granted to counsel for respondents
5 ,6 and 7 to file reply but neither any reply has been filed nor any representation is
made.

2. The petitioner has filed this petition aggrieved by the action of the

respondents 5 and 6 in installing electric pole in front of the plot of the petitioner for extending electric line upto the plot of respondent no.7.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that while laying down electric cable, respondent No.7 has affixed pole in such a manner that the electric pole is crossing over the plot of the petitioner whereas enough space is available on the other side, towards the plot of respondent No.7 for extension of line upto the plot of respondent No.7.

4. The averments made by the petitioner is not opposed by any of the respondents by filing reply. It appears that for extension of electric line, instead of affixing pole in front of the plot of respondent No.7, respondents 5 and 6 affixed the plot in front of the plot of the petitioner in such a manner that the electric line is crossing over the plot of the petitioner.

The representation made by the petitioner has not been decided and reply has also not been filed. In view of above, the petition is allowed. Respondents 5 and 6 are directed to change the alignment of electric pole in a manner that it does not cross over and above the plot of the petitioner.

Sd/-

(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge