

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.12.2017
CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE V.PARTHIBAN

W.P.No.24079 of 2008

M.Gangachalam

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.State of Tamil Nadu, rep by its
Secretary to Government,
Energy Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur.
- 3.Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Rep by its Chairman,
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.
- 4.The Superintending Engineer (North),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Mannarpuram, Trichy.
- 5.The Assistant Engineer, (O & M) (North),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Jayamkondam, Perambalur District.
- 6.The Executive Officer,
Amanakkan Thondi Panchayat,
Jayamkondam Taluk,
Perambalur District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to pay Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs only) as compensation and damages for the death of petitioner's daughter Miss.Gowdiga, on 24.06.2005 (aged 14 years) along with interest at the rate of 9% p.a. from the date of death till the date of payment.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Premkumar

For Respondents : Mr.S.Gunasekaran,

Additional Government Pleader for RR1 & 2

: Mr.Gunaraj for RR3 to 5
: Mr.R.S.Selvam,
Government Advocate for R6

O R D E R

Heard Mr.K.Premkumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.S.Gunasekaran, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the first and second respondents, Mr.Gunaraj, learned counsel for the respondent Nos.3 to 5 and Mr.R.S.Selvam, learned Government Advocate appearing for the sixth respondent.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court for seeking the following relief,

"To issue a writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to pay Rs.10,00,000/- (Rupees Ten Lakhs only) as compensation and damages for the death of petitioner's daughter Miss.Gowdiga, on 24.06.2005 (aged 14 years) along with interest at the rate of 9% p.a. from the date of death till the date of payment."

3. The case of the petitioner is as follows:-

The petitioner is an agricultural coolie and he has three sons and one daughter and his daughter aged about 14 years, was studying 7th Standard at Puduchavadi Middle School, Jayamkondam Taluk, Perambalur District. On 24.06.2005, at about 6.15 p.m., his daughter had gone to the Panchayat Road to fetch drinking water from the water tap maintained by the sixth respondent herein. At the time of fetching the water, the Electricity over-head line which was hanging precariously, was snapped and fell down on his daughter and she died on the spot. The petitioner himself is a witness to the accident, since he was come out of his house at that time, which house is nearly located to the Panchayat Road.

4. After the incident, the fifth respondent disconnected the power supply at about 6.45 p.m. on that day. Thereafter, some of the local officials came and assured to make arrangements for payment of compensation for the negligence on the part of the Electricity Board, in not properly maintaining the over-head line. A police complaint also lodged in that connection and it was also registered under Section 174 of Cr.P.C.(Electrocution). However, According to the petitioner, no progress has been made in regard to the criminal complaint.

5. After the incident, the sixth respondent Panchayat has passed a resolution vide Resolution No.19, resolving the request to District Collector to take appropriate action for replacement and proper maintenance of over-head Electricity line, since the same was erected as early as in the year 1962. According to the

petitioner, the same Electricity line had caused a damage to the properties of the local villager man and also several cattles had died due to electrocution. Since no compensation was forthcoming from the respondents, a notice was issued seeking payment of the compensation of Rs.10,00,000/-. According to the petitioner, unfortunately he lost his daughter due to poor maintenance of over-head Electricity line and the Board Officials are entirely responsible for the loss of precious life. Since the claim for compensation has not been answered favourably, the petitioner is before this Court, seeking to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the third respondent Board to pay compensation of Rs.10,00,000/-.

6. Upon notice, learned counsel entered appearance and filed a detailed counter on behalf of the fourth and fifth respondents. From the counter affidavit, it is seen that the averments contained in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition had been mechanically refuted without proper application of mind, for example, in paragraph 5 of the counter affidavit, it is specifically denied that no resolution was passed by the local Panchayat on 26.01.2005, requesting the District Collector to take appropriate action for replacement and proper maintenance of over-head Electricity line. When the fact of the matter was raised, such resolution has been passed by the Panchayat and the copy of the resolution was enclosed along with the file of documents submitted in support of the writ petition. Likewise, several averments of the petitioner had been refuted without even verifying the facts on records as to the basis of such averments made by the petitioner.

7. While so, this Court has to first take into consideration whether the petitioner is entitled to the compensation, since the facts and circumstances would unequivocally indicate that the over-head Electricity line was not been properly maintained and the same was established as in the year 1962. Therefore, there was a capable negligence on the part of the Electricity Board, had caused the unfortunate death of the only daughter of the petitioner at young age of 14 years. But an accident of compensation to be awarded in the present is an award of the compensation is therefore, not a conclusion but the accident of compensation payable for defence of facts and circumstances of each case. This Court again has considered such claims and awards of various amounts of compensation to the family of the victims, but the uniform decisions of this Court have been that the families of the victims always entitled to compensation, in case of negligence on the part of the said authorities in not maintaining the public utility services properly.

8. During the course of argument, the learned counsel for the petitioner had submitted a memo of calculation, which is

extracted hereunder:-

"MEMO OF CALCULATION FILED BY THE PETITIONER

Income of the deceased	: Rs.3,000/-
Less: 1/4 th Personal Expenses	: Rs.750/-
Annual Income (2,250 x 12)	: Rs.27,000/-
Multiplier (Rs.27,000 x 15)	: Rs.4,86,000/-
Funeral Expenses & Transportation	: Rs.20,000/-
Loss of Consortium	: Rs.50,000/-
Loss of Love and Affection	: Rs.50,000/-

Total Rs.6,06,750/-

(Rupees six lakhs, six thousand, seven hundred and fifty only)

Further the petitioner is entitled to interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of Writ petition till the date of payment."

As per the above claim, the learned counsel would pray that as per the above calculation, grant of Rs.6,06,750/- may be considered, since the same is just and reasonable.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner, in support of his contentions for a grant of just and reasonable compensation, has relied on the following decisions,

(I) In the case of Sarla Verma (Smt) and others Vs. Delhi Transport Corporation and another, reported in (2009) 6 Supreme Court Cases 121. The relevant portion of the judgment at Paragraph Nos.16, 17 and 18, are extracted below:-

"16. Compensation awarded does not become "just compensation" merely because the Tribunal considers it to be just. For example, if on the same or similar facts (say the deceased aged 40 years having annual income of Rs.45,000/- leaving his surviving wife and child), one Tribunal awards Rs.10,00,000/- another awards Rs.5,00,000/- and yet another awards Rs.1,00,000/- all believing that the amount is just, it cannot be said that what is awarded in the first case and the last case is just compensation. "just compensation" is adequate compensation which is fair and equitable, on the facts and circumstances of the case, to make good the loss suffered as a result of the wrong, as far as money can do so, by applying the well-settled principles relating to award of compensation. It is not intended to be a bonanza, largesse or source of profit.

17. Assessment of compensation though involving certain hypothetical considerations, should nevertheless be objective. Justice and justness emanate from equality in treatment, consistency and thoroughness in adjudication and fairness and

uniformity in the decision-making process and the decisions while it may not be possible to have mathematical precision or identical awards in assessing compensation, same or similar facts should lead to awards in the same range. When the factors/inputs are the same, and the formula/legal principles are the same, consistency and uniformity and not divergence and freakiness, should be the result of adjudication to arrive at just compensation, In *Susamma Thomas*, this Court stated : (SCC p.185, para 16)

"16....The proper method of computation is the multiplier method. Any departure, except in exceptional and extraordinary cases, would introduce inconsistency of principle, lack of uniformity and an element of unpredictability, for the assessment of compensation."

18. Basically only three facts need to be established by the claimants for assessing compensation in the case of death:

- (a) age of the deceased;
- (b) income of the deceased; and
- (c) the number of dependants.

The issues to be determined by the Tribunal to arrive at the loss of dependency are:

- (i) additions/deductions to be made for arriving at the income;
- (ii) the deduction to be made towards the personal living expenses of the deceased; and
- (iii) the multiplier to be applied with reference to the age of the deceased.

If these determinants are standardised, there will be uniformity and consistency in the decisions. There will be lesser need for detailed evidence. It will also be easier for the insurance companies to settle accident claims without delay."

The judgment also referred to for applying multiplier in regard to different age groups as found in paragraph 42, which is extracted below:-

"42. We therefore hold that the multiplier to be used should be as mentioned in Column (4) of the table above (prepared by applying *Susamma Thomas*, *Trilok Chandra* and *Charlie*), which starts with an operative multiplier of 18 (for the age groups of 15 to 20 and 21 to 25 years), reduced by one unit for every five years, that is M-17 for 26 to 30 years, M-16 for 31 to 35 years, M-15 for 36 to 40 years, M-14 for 41 to 45 years and M-13 for 46 to 50 years, then reduced by two units for every five years, that is,

M-11 for 51 to 55 years, M-9 for 56 to 60 years, M-7 for 61 to 65 years and M-5 for 66 to 70 years."

(II). In the case of The Chairman, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and another Vs. Parvathi Ammal and 6 others, reported in 2003 (4) CTC 517. The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court, dealing with similar cases of electrocution as held in the following paragraph nos.16,17,18,19 and 20, which are extracted below:-

"16. The requirements of the tort of negligence has been summarized in Clerk & Lindsell on Torts, 15th Edition-1982, Sweet and Maxwell.

"The tort is committed when damage, which is not too remote, is caused by the breach of a duty of care owed by the defendant to be plaintiff. In traditional terminology the ingredients of liability are a duty, of care, breach and damage; but for reasons that will become apparent, each of these terms is so ambiguous that unnecessary confusion results. Between them they yield an irreducible minimum of six requirements namely,

(i) the existence in law of a duty of care situation, i.e., one in which the law attaches liability to carelessness. There has to be recognition by law that the careless infliction of the kind of damage in suit on the type of person to which the plaintiff belongs by the type of person to which the defendant belongs is actionable

(ii) Careless behaviour by the defendant, i.e., it failed to measure up to the standard and scope set by law.

(iii) Foreseeability that such conduct would have inflicted damage on the plaintiff and of the kind of which he complains. (This is what is implied in the statement that the duty of care has to be "owed" to the plaintiff).

(iv) A causal connection between the defendant's carelessness and the damage. When these four requirements are satisfied, the defendant is liable in negligence. The and only then do the next two considerations arise, namely,

(v) The extent of the damage attributable to the defendant; and

(vi) The monetary estimate of that extent of damage.

There is no magic in the order as set out, nor should it be supposed that Courts proceed from points (i) to (vi) in sequence."

17. In our case, the first four ingredients are satisfied. It has been established that the

Department was at fault in not taking the necessary precautions to prevent theft. The lineman concerned was not a resident of the locality, though the rules require him to be a resident of the locality. The rules further require that the workmen should periodically conduct inspection and check that no theft has taken place. The circuit breaker had not been shown to have been fixed. Thus, there is a overwhelming material to show that the accident was entirely due to the negligence on the part of the Department.

18. In *Nirmal Thirunavukkarasu and others Vs. Tamil Nadu Electricity Board etc.*, 1984 (97) L.W.42, it has been held that:

"overhead electric wires carrying heavy load of electric energy are highly dangerous and if any human being or animal comes into contact with the same, the consequences are fatal. Hence, great care and caution are expected of the Electricity Board in laying, installing and maintaining overhead wires and generally these wires do not snap and fall down. If therefore, such a thing happens, a prima facie inference can be drawn that there has been carelessness or negligence on the part of the Electricity Board in transmitting electric energy or in maintaining the transmission lines. The Electricity Board has also to take precaution against dangers of live wires snapping and falling down under unforeseen circumstances, by providing for automatic disconnection of supply of electric energy."

19. Rule 91 of Indian Electricity Rules, 1956 provides that every overhead line which is not covered with insulating material and which is erected over any part of a street or other public place or any factory or mine or on any consumer's premises shall be protected with a device approved by the Inspector for rendering the line electrically harmless in case it breaks. If the precaution under this Rule is taken, the line, in case it breaks, would become dead and harmless. Needless to say that in the instant case, precautions contemplated had not been taken. The points arising for decision in this regard are answered against the appellants.

20. The next question relates to damages.

"The amount of money as reparation for the results of tortious conduct for which the law holds the wrongdoer responsible is determined by applying as far as possible the general principles of restitution integrum. In many cases, a perfect compensation is hardly possible and would be even be

unjust. The Court in doing justice between the parties considers the general rules as to damages with some liberality and does not apply them rigidly, and, thus the damages are in difficult cases normally limited to a sum which can in the circumstances be considered as reasonable amount of compensation. Courts should not also be in such cases allow a calamity to turn into a windfall. In ascertaining the pecuniary loss caused to the dependants, it must be borne in mind that these damages are not to be given as solatium for the loss of a son or daughter, wife or husband, father or mother, not on sympathetic or sentimental consideration, but only with reference to pecuniary loss. The pecuniary loss has to be concluded with reference to reasonable expectation of pecuniary benefit from the continuance of the life of the deceased."

(III). In the case of K.Sampath @ Chidambaranathan Vs.The Superintendent Engineer-I, Puducherry, reported in 2013, Writ L.R.176. This is also the case of death by electrocution and the Electricity Board was held to be liable vicariously by the learned Judge of this Court. The relevant portion of the said judgment at Paragraph Nos. 9,10 and 11, which are extracted below:-

"9. Payment of compensation can be ordered by the High Court in appropriate case, particularly when there is no factual disputes, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is no longer res integra, in this regard, the following decisions can be usefully referred to.

(i) In AIR 2000 SC 988:(2000) 2 SCC 465 (Chairman, Railway Board Vs. Chandima Das), a sum of Rs.10 lakhs was awarded as compensation to a Bangladeshi National, who was sexually assaulted by Eastern Railway employee. Order of the High Court awarding the said compensation was upheld by the Supreme Court.

(ii) In AIR 2001 SC 3668:(2001) 8 SCC 151=2002-1-L.W.491 (M.S.Grewal V.Deep Chand Sood), Rs.4.10 lakhs each was awarded for the unfortunate death of 14 young children, who died due to drowning in a river, when they were on picnic organised by the School Authorities.

(iii) In (2005) 9 SCC 586 (MCD Vs.Association of Victims of Uphaar Tragedy) the Supreme Court ordered payment of compensation to the families of those, who died in uphaar Tragedy and directed the MCD to deposit Rs.3,01,40,000/- (Rupees Three Crores One lakh and Forty Thousand) and 50% of the said amount was

directed to be distributed to the claimants.

(iv) In 2011 AIR SCW 4916 (Delhi Jal Board V. National Campaign for Dignity and Rights of Sewerage and Allied Workers), the Supreme Court enhanced the compensation awarded by the High Court of Delhi to sewerage workers' family to Rs.3.29 lakhs, over and above Rs.1.71 lakhs already paid by the Government.

Insofar as our High Court is concerned, the said issue is dealt with in several cases. Few decisions are as follows:

(a) 2001 WLR 174 (C.Chinnathambi V. State of Tamil Nadu)-Rs.1.50 lakhs with 12% interest was ordered to be paid to each school students, who died while water tank broke and fell on them.

(b) 2004 WLR 346 (Smt.R.Dhanalakshmi V. Government of Tamil Nadu)-Rs.9.00 lakhs was ordered to be paid to the family of a prisoner, who was killed while in custody.

(c) 2004 WLR 611 (DB) (The Chief Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu V. Mr.R.Selvam)-Rs.5.00 lakhs was ordered to be paid by the State due to the killing of a medical student inside the Government Medical College Hostel.

(d) 2006 WLR 13 (DB) (C.Thekkamalai V. State of Tamil Nadu) - The Division bench enhanced the compensation from Rs.75,000/- to Rs.5.00 lakhs for the rape victim, who was illegally arrested and raped.

(e) 2006 WLR 608 (Lakshmana Naidu (decd) V. State of Tamil Nadu & Another)-a sum of Rs.5.00 lakhs was ordered as compensation to the family of the deceased.

(f) 2008 (6) CTC 144 (P.N.Kanagaraj V. Chief Secretary, State of Tamil Nadu) - Rs.4.10 lakhs with 9% interest was ordered for the death of a school boy.

(g) 2009 (1) CTC 434 (Subramaniam V. State of Tamil Nadu) - A sum of Rs.3.50 lakhs was directed to be paid for the death of the student in the school due to negligence of the Government School Teacher.

(h) 2010 WLR 851 (DB) : 2010 (1) CWC 455 (T.Sekaran V. State of Tamil Nadu & others) - A sum of Rs.9,07,000/- was directed to be paid to the family of a person, who was shot dead by the Security Warden of Madurai Central Prison.

(i) 2011 (1) CWC 786 (The Registrar Administration, Madurai Bench of Madras High Court V. Secretary to Government, (Home Department) - A sum of Rs.10 lakhs was ordered to the family of an advocate, who died due to not providing immediate medical treatment, in the High Court premises.

(j) 2011 (6) CTC 636 (P.Ravichandran V. The Government of Tamil Nadu) - A sum of Rs.18.00 lakhs

was ordered as compensation to the victim, who suffered 100% disability while doing drainage work.

(k) 2012 (2) CTC 848 (Ganesan V. The State of Tamil Nadu) - A sum of Rs.10.00 lakhs was ordered to be paid by the State to the family of a victim, who died due to bomb attack while travelling in a Transport Corporation Bus.

(l) In (2011) 1 MLJ 1409 (V.Ramar V. Director of Medical and Rural Health Services) this Court directed the State to pay a sum of Rs.5.00 lakhs to the family of a woman, who died during delivery due to the negligence of the Government Hospital authorities.

(m) In (2011) 1 MLJ 1329 (Thangapandi V. Director of Primary Health Services) - A sum of Rs.5 lakhs was ordered to the family of a woman, who died after delivery, due to not giving proper treatment by Government Hospital Doctors.

(n) In W.P.No.23003 of 2011 dated 24.11.2011, this Court awarded a sum of Rs.10.00 lakhs to the family of a deceased student as he was killed while staying in Government Hostel.

(o) In W.P.No.20081 of 2007 dated 04.06.2012, I had an occasion to award a sum of Rs.29.26 lakhs to the petitioner therein, who lost both his parents due to fall of a tree on the road side.

Applying the above decisions to the facts of this case, I am of the view that the respondent department is liable to pay compensation to the family of the petitioner for the death of petitioner's wife Malathy due to electrocution on 17.05.2009.

10. There is no codified law for arriving at the quantum of compensation in cases of this type. The enactments like Motor Vehicles Act, 1988; Workmen Compensation Act, 1948; and fatal Accidents Act, 1855 may be applied for arriving at the just compensation. In the decision reported in (1969) 3 SCC 64 (C.K.Subramania Iyer V. T.Kunhikuttan Nair) the Supreme Court held that there is no exact uniform rule for measuring the value of human life and the measure of damages cannot be arrived at precisely. In the decision reported in (2001) 8 SCC 151 (M.S.Grewal V. Deep Chand Sood) the Supreme Court held that multiplier method may be adopted to arrive at the just compensation. The age of the deceased can also be taken for arriving at a correct multiplier as per the judgment of the Supreme Court reported in 2011 (5) LW 408 (P.Somanathan & others V. District Insurance Officer & Another).

11. How the Court should decide the cases of this nature is emphasised by the Supreme Court in the

decision reported in (2011) 10 SCC 634 (Ibrahim V. Raju). In para 9 of its held thus,

"9. This Court has time and again emphasised that the officers, who preside over the Tribunals adopt a proactive approach and ensure that the claims filed under the Act are disposed of with required urgency and compensation is awarded to the victims of the accident and/ or their legal representatives in adequate measure keeping in view the relevant factors. Unfortunately, despite repeated pronouncements of this Court in which guiding principles have been laid down for determination of the compensation payable to the victims of road accidents and/or their families, the Tribunals and even the High Courts do not pay serious attention to the imperative of awarding just compensation to the claimants."

In (2009) 13 SCC 422 (Reshma Kumari V. Madan Mohan) the Supreme Court pointed out the need of giving just compensation to the victim. In paragraphs 26 and 27 it is held thus,

"26. The compensation which is required to be determined must be just. While the claimants are required to be compensated for the loss of their dependency, the same should not be considered to be a windfall. Unjust enrichment should be discouraged. This Court cannot also lose sight of the fact that in given cases, as for example death of the only son to a mother, she can never be compensated in monetary terms.

27. The question as to the methodology required to be applied for determination of compensation as regards prospective loss of future earnings, however, as far as possible should be based on certain principles. A person may have a bright future prospect; he might have become eligible to promotion immediately; there might have been chances of an immediate pay revision, whereas in another (sic situation) the nature of employment was such that he might not have continued in service, his chance of promotion, having regard to the nature of employment may be distant or remote. It is, therefore, difficult for any Court to lay down rigid tests which should be applied in

all situations. There are divergent views. In some cases it has been suggested that some sort of hypotheses or guess work may be inevitable. That may be so".

This Court is bound to bear-in-mind the above stated principles for arriving at just compensation."

In the above decision, the learned Judge had referred to several decisions where this Court had granted compensation ranging from Rs.5,00,000/- to Rs.29,26,000/- for loss of life due to negligence.

(IV). In the case of Saroja Vs. Government of Tamil Nadu, rep. by its Secretary, Electricity Department and another, reported in 2014 (3) CTC 553. This is also a case of death due to electrocution where the Electricity Board was found to be negligence in maintaining power cables. The learned Judge of this Court has also adverted to various decisions of this Court, in granting compensation in similar situations and finally held that the petitioner therein was entitled to a sum of Rs.6,04,600/- only towards compensation for the death of petitioner's minor son. In fact, learned Judge also directed to pay the amount with interest at the rate of 7.5% per annum, from the date of writ petition till the date of deposit.

(V). In the case of R.Pareetha Beevi and 2 others Vs. The Chairman, TNEB and 3 others, reported in 2014 (2) CWC 337. Yet another learned Judge of this Court has granted compensation after adverting to various decisions of this Court and ultimately awarded Rs.5,00,000/- for the loss of the petitioner's family member. This was a case of custodial death. The learned Judge also directed payment with interest at the rate of 6% per annum, from the date of writ petition till the date of payment.

(VI). Recently, the learned Judge of this Court in the case of P.Siva Shakthivel Vs. The Chairman, Tamil Nadu Electricity Board and another, in W.P.No.1845 of 2010, passed an order on 31.07.2017, granting compensation of Rs.6,00,000/- for the loss of petitioner's daughter with the interest at the rate of 12%. This is also a case where the School going girl had come into contact with the live Electricity cable in the road, while returning from School and got electrocuted and succumbed to the injuries. The learned Judge thought fit to grant Rs.6,00,000/- as compensation on the basis of several orders passed in similar situation.

10. After taking note of the settled legal principles on the subject matter and considering the above facts and decisions submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that the memo of calculation submitted

on behalf of the petitioner reflects just and reasonable compensation payable to the petitioner. Although Rs.10,00,000/- was the amount claimed by the petitioner, however, the claim has been restricted to Rs.6,06,750/-. This Court after going through the memo of calculation, satisfied with the break up of figures furnished and also finds that the compensation claimed is just and reasonable.

11. The learned counsel appearing for the Electricity Board would submit that the Board proceedings dated 29.04.2013, in which the Board was liable to pay compensation upto Rs.2,00,000/- for fatal accidents towards compensation. However, grant of compensation of Rs.2,00,000/- cannot be said to be just and reasonable in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in view of the decisions cited above. Therefore, this Court has no hesitation in allowing the claim of the petitioner as per the memo of calculation submitted before this Court. The Board cannot shirk its responsibility of payment of just and reasonable compensation to the family of the victim, due to their negligence and present claim by the petitioner cannot be said to be unreasonable or unjust.

12. In the said circumstances, the third respondent is directed to pay a sum of Rs.6,06,750/- as per the memo of calculation, which is extracted supra, to the petitioner within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The amount shall carry interest at the rate of 9% per annum, from the date of writ petition till the date of payment. The Board is directed strictly to comply with the direction within a stipulated time.

13. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gsk

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Energy Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai 600 009.

2.The District Collector,
Perambalur District,
Perambalur.

3.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.
W.P.No.24079 of 2008

4.The Superintending Engineer (North),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Mannarpuram, Trichy.

5.The Assistant Engineer, (O & M) (North),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Jayamkondam, Perambalur District.

6.The Executive Officer,
Amanakkan Thondi Panchayat,
Jayamkondam Taluk,
Perambalur District.

+1cc to Mr.P.Gunaraj, Advocate, S.R.No.86472

+1cc to Mr.R.S.Selvam, Advocate, S.R.No.86647

+1cc to Mr.K.Premkumar, Advocate, S.R.No.86987

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.86893

WP.No.24079 of 2008

RK(CO)
RRK(22/01/2018)

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY