

CWP No.16254 of 2017

[1]

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

**CWP No.16254 of 2017
Date of decision:26.07.2017**

Sat Bala

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Aditya Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

This petition is filed by the mother of Ankit, who died because of electric shock, for which a criminal case bearing FIR No.290 dated 27.07.2016, under Section 304-A IPC was registered against the respondent-department. The cause of death has been found to be electric shock.

It is not disputed that the petitioner has already been compensated by the respondent-department by paying ₹8,25,000/-.

Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the compensation awarded to the petitioner is not adequate and has prayed that it may be enhanced. In this regard, he has relied upon two decisions of this Court rendered in the cases of **Anita Devi and others vs. State of Haryana and others**, CWP No.24238 of 2014, decided on 19.09.2016 and **Raman vs. State of Haryana and others**, CWP No.14046 of 2012, decided on 02.07.2013.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and examined the available record with his able assistance.

At the time of his death, the deceased son of the petitioner was 18 years of age and was a student of 10+2. In **Anita Devi's case (supra)**, which is also a case of death due to electrocution, the deceased was of 28 years of age and keeping in view the fact that he was an able bodied person and was in a capacity to earn at least ₹5,000/- per month and would have spent at least one third on himself and his contribution towards his family would have to be ₹3,500/- per month, the multiplier of 16 was applied and a compensation of ₹6,72,000/- was awarded.

In the present case, the deceased was of 18 years and was not earning anything. Even if the same principle is applied, as has been applied in **Anita Devi's case (supra)**, the multiplier cannot go beyond 17 and the compensation would have been less than what has already been awarded to the petitioner, i.e. of ₹8,25,000/-. Insofar as **Raman's case (supra)** is concerned, that was altogether different because in that case, Raman suffered electrocution and lost both his hands and one leg and the compensation was assessed only on that account, which cannot be applied to this case.

In view of the above, I do not find any reason to interfere in the present petition and hence, the same is hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit, though without any order as to costs.

July 26, 2017
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No