

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.9997 of 2018
Date of Decision:22.05.2018

Sandeep Raman

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: - Mr.Ashish Verma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J.

The petitioner has prayed for diversion of the High Voltage
220 KV electricity wire from his residence.

In brief, it is alleged that the petitioner and his sisters are the
owners in possession of the property falling in Khasra No.59//19/1/1
(2K-7M) situated within the Municipal limits of Samalkha. The sisters of
the petitioner have allegedly executed a General Power of Attorney in his
favour in respect of the property in question which is a residential house and
was built several years back. It is further averred that on the back side of the
house there was another premises owned by the petitioner and his family
members and immediately at the back of the same there exists a 220 KV
sub-station of Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (respondent No.2),
which has already laid several 220 KV electricity/power lines from this
sub-station for the supply of electricity and already a number of lines are
going over the boundary of the house of the petitioner but he did not raise

any objection. It is alleged that respondent No.2 is trying to lay High Voltage 220 KV electricity lines exactly over the roof of the house of the petitioner to which he has allegedly raised an objection. The petitioner has also appended photographs as Annexure P-3. The petitioner has allegedly made a representation also for not raising the wires over his house and when his representation was not heard, he has filed this petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the available record with his able assistance from which I have not found any cause of concern for the purpose of filing this petition. The photographs (Annexure P-3) clearly show that the wires have already been laid and there is no sign of any inconvenience having been caused to the petitioner. Actually the photographs appended by the petitioner are sufficient to hold that he does not have any cause for the purpose of issuance of any kind of direction to the respondents.

Dismissed.

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

22.05.2018

Vivek

Whether speaking /reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No