

CWP Nos.13529 & 13542 of 2016

[1]

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

(1) CWP No.13529 of 2016

Baljit Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation and others ...Respondents

(2) CWP No.13542 of 2016

Varinder Singh ...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation and others ...Respondents

Date of decision:13.07.2016

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. B.S.Jaswal, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CWP Nos.13529 and 13542 of 2016 as in both the cases, the petitioner(s) have challenged the assessment order dated 18.09.2014 and the order passed in appeal dated 23.02.2016. However, for the sake of convenience, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.13529 of 2016.

In CWP No.13529 of 2016, the amount demanded is ₹52,443/-, whereas in CWP No.13542 of 2016, it is ₹42,345/- towards the theft of electricity. It is observed in the impugned order(s) that the petitioner(s) did not even file reply to the notice issued under Section 126 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and that the checking report was signed by the wife of the

CWP Nos.13529 & 13542 of 2016

[2]

petitioner, therefore, there was no occasion for videography or photography of the checking.

Counsel for the petitioner(s) has submitted that the petitioner(s) have been involved in the false case at the behest of the local MLA but admittedly, the local MLA has not been impleaded as a party to contest the contention of the petitioner(s) made in this regard.

After perusal of record and hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner(s), I do not find any reason to interfere in the impugned order(s) just on the ground that the entire proceedings are false because it has been initiated at the behest of the local MLA to implicate the petitioner(s) in the case of theft of electricity.

Dismissed.

July 13, 2016
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge