

CWP Nos.9474 and 12520 of 2015

[1]

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

(1) **CWP No.9474 of 2015**
Date of decision:05.12.2017

Ranjit Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others ...Respondents

(2) **CWP No.12520 of 2015**
Date of decision:05.12.2017

Karamjit Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others ...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. Mohd. Yousuf, Advocate,
for the petitioner in CWP No.9474 of 2015.

Mr. Dhirinder Chopra, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CWP No.12520 of 2015.

Mr. B.S.Mittal, Advocate,
for respondents no.1 to 3.

Mr. Vikas Chatrath, Advocate,
for respondent no.4.

Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate, for
Mr. Deepak Manchanda, Advocate, for respondent no.5.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

This common order shall dispose of two petitions bearing CWP Nos.9474 and 12520 of 2015 as an identical issue is involved in both the petitions. However, for the sake of convenience, the facts are being extracted from CWP No.9474 of 2015.

The petitioners have challenged the letter dated 09.12.2014 issued by respondent no.3 by which route plan for installation of 66 KV power

transmission line from village Naudharani Grid to newly constructed Grid at village Hathan has been revised. The petitioner(s) have made the allegations that the route plan has been revised in order to accommodate respondent no.4 who is the Executive Engineer in the Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, much-less to save his land, which was coming under the original route. It is also the allegation of the petitioners that the revised route plan would entail wasteful expenditure and is being changed without any cogent reason.

On 13.11.2017, the following order was passed by this Court:-

“Learned counsel for respondents no.1 to 3 shall file affidavit of respondent no.3 in which the detail would be provided about the expenditure which would have been incurred for the purpose of installation of the electricity line on the original route plan and the expenditure to be incurred on the revised route plan. The reason and the decision taken by respondents no.1 to 3 for changing the route should also be mentioned. The needful be done on the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 05.12.2017.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.”

Apropos, the respondents have filed the affidavit dated 01.12.2017 of Balbir Singh Sidhu, Chief Engineer, Transmission Systems, PSPCL, Patiala, in which the following averments have been made:-

“1. That the expenditure which would have been incurred on the original route plan was Rs.180 Lacs and the expenditure to be incurred on the revised route plan is Rs.201 Lacs. As per revised route plan 60% work of the feeding 66 KV line has been completed.

2. That the main reason to revise the route plan was the change of location of the 66 KV Grid Sub Station, Hathan. The earlier Gram Panchayat given the land in Khasra No.8 and in Khewat No.972 on some other place vide resolution No.2 dated 23.02.2006 (Annexure R-7) in the year 2006 but the same was

lateron changed by Gram Panchayat in Khasra No.2533/346 vide resolution dated 21.09.2012 (Annexure P-5).

3. That moreover, after receiving the representation of the residents of the village, a three member committee was constituted vide office order No.216 dated 05.09.2014 for examining the original and revised route. The committee observed that the revised route is almost straight and technically correct as compared to original route and accordingly objections were invited for revised route plan vide notification dated 09.12.2014 (Annexure P-3).

4. That it is pertinent to mention here that if the location of 66 KV grid had not been changed then the revised route length would be 131 Meter less in comparison to original route.”

After hearing learned counsel for the parties in detail and keeping in view the averments made in both the petitions, especially the aforesaid affidavit, I do not find any ground to interfere in the present petitions as the respondents have given reasons for changing the route plan and that 60% work on the revised route has already been over and because of the pendency of the present petitions, the work has come to a standstill.

Consequently, the present petitions are hereby dismissed being denuded of any merit, though without any order as to costs.

December 05, 2017
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:	Yes/No