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

CWP No.6416 of 2016

Date of decision:04.05.2018

Paramjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

The Permanent Lok Adalat and others

...Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

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

Mr. Ashok Kumar Sharma, Advocate,
for respondents no.2 and 3.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.

The petitioner is aggrieved against the order/award dated 08.02.2016 of the Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services), Rupnagar (hereinafter referred to as the "Lok Adalat") by which her application filed under Section 22-C of the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987 (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") has been dismissed.

In brief, the petitioner has challenged the recovery of an amount of ₹18,254/- by the respondents pertaining to the bill dated 05.12.2014. She has alleged that the said bill relates to the electricity meter installed in the name of her late husband who has died on 03.05.2013 and allegedly not paid the electricity bill and the arrears were accumulated to the tune of ₹18,254/-. However, the stand taken by the respondents before the Lok Adalat is that the petitioner had obtained a new connection in the same premises after giving an

assurance that she would pay the arrears of ₹18,254/- in three installments. She though had paid the first installment of ₹6,200/-, upon which the new connection was released but, thereafter, refused to pay the remaining amount, which she is legally and morally bound to pay.

The case set up by the petitioner is that she is not liable to pay the arrears which is due to another person as she has been given a new connection. This argument has rightly not been accepted by the Lok Adalat because the new connection was provided in the same premises from where the earlier connection was disconnected on account of non-payment of arrears by her husband and the new connection was granted only on the assurance of the petitioner that she would pay the arrears and had even paid the first installment.

Thus, there is hardly any scope in this petition for the purpose of interference by this Court and hence, the same is hereby dismissed.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed that the respondents may be asked to accept the payment of the remaining amount in installments.

However, learned counsel for the respondents has submitted that he has no instructions to make a statement in this regard.

Be that as it may, while dismissing the writ petition, it is directed that in case the petitioner makes an application before the respondents for making payment of the remaining amount by way of installments, the same shall be considered by the respondents sympathetically.

May 04, 2018
vinod*

(Rakesh Kumar Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No