

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

COCN No.551 of 2016

Date of decision : 26.02.2018

Sharda Kadan

.....Petitioner

Versus

Sham Lal

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Pratibha Sethi, Advocate for the respondent.

* * *

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

In pursuance of order dated 02.11.2015 passed in CWP No.23279 of 2015, a communication was sent to the petitioner on 09.05.2016 stating that in the premises in dispute a three phase connection under account No.KR/32/781 was running which remained in default due to non-payment of the bills and the house had been locked permanently. It has also been stated that as per office record the account holder is in default of payment of ₹1,57,673/- and the petitioner has been asked to deposit the amount. On perusal of order dated 02.11.2015, it shows that only a direction was given to respondent No.3 to look into the application for release of domestic connection to the petitioner and in case of any deficiency, the same was to be communicated to the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no

communication has been sent so far and the letter issued to her has already been replied on 13.10.2016 and, thereafter, no order has been passed.

Since the compliance of the order is there and reasons have been conveyed to the petitioner after considering the representation, no contempt is made out.

However, in case letter sent by the respondent has been replied and, thereafter no order has been passed, the respondent is directed to pass a speaking order after considering the reply submitted by the petitioner. In case the presence of the petitioner is required, he be given opportunity of hearing.

Disposed of.

26.02.2018

sunil yadav

**(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No