

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

CWP No. 11872 of 2014

Date of decision : 14.07.2017

Meena Kumari

...Petitioner

V/s

UHBVN & anr.

...Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Sanjay Panghal, Advocate for
Mr. S.S. Nara, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Poonia, Advocate for the respondents.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

Petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this court challenging notice dated 06.03.2014 passed under section 126 of the Electricity Act raising a demand of ₹3,91,164/- on the petitioner for alleged unauthorized use of connection. At the outset, learned counsel for the respondents-Nigam has submitted that against the demand petitioner had a remedy to file an appeal before the appellate authority. While issuing notice of motion this court had directed the Nigam to restore the electric connection to enable the petitioner to sow the paddy crops. Three years have elapsed since this order was passed. There can be no doubt about the fact that petitioner has efficacious alternative remedy in view of provisions of section 127 of the Electricity Act.

Under the circumstances, no ground to interfere in writ jurisdiction is made out. Same is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to invoke the alternate remedy.

July 14, 2017

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE