

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

**RSA No. 4429 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 9.5.2018**

**Jaswant Singh**

**... Appellant**

**Versus**

**Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. and another ... Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI**

Present: Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate  
for the appellant.

\*\*\*

**ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)**

The suit filed by the plaintiff was dismissed by the trial court, vide judgment and decree dated 7.9.2015. As even the appeal preferred against the said decree failed and was dismissed on 30.4.2016, the plaintiff is in Regular Second Appeal. Parties to the lis, hereinafter, shall be referred to by their original positions in the suit.

Plaintiff prayed for a declaration that memo No. 1250 dated 27.9.2012, issued by the defendants, vide which the documents furnished by the plaintiff for obtaining electric tubewell connection, on priority basis out of Chairman quota, were alleged to be forged, was illegal, null and void.

On a consideration of the matter in issue and the evidence on record, both the courts concurrently concluded that vide notice, dated 27.9.2012, the plaintiff was merely informed that during the discreet enquiry conducted by the Corporation, the documents furnished by the plaintiff were found to be false. But, he was granted 15 days' time to respond

**RSA No. 4429 of 2016 (O&M)**

**-2-**

thereto, and approach the Chairman of the Corporation to get his documents verified. Meaning thereby, plaintiff was only required to show cause, as to why his connection be not withdrawn. But, rather than responding to the said notice and expressing his view point, he instead filed the present suit on 5.10.2012, i.e. merely seven days after issuance of the said notice. Nothing could be shown as to how any prejudice was caused or rights of the plaintiff were effected by mere issuance of notice dated 27.9.2012. That being so, the only and the inevitable conclusion that the courts below could reach: the suit was devoid of merit. On being pointedly asked, learned counsel for the appellant could not show as to how, the findings recorded by both the courts were either contrary to the record or suffered from any material illegality.

Thus, no question of law, much less any substantial question of law, arises for consideration. The appeal being devoid of merit, is accordingly dismissed.

9.5.2018  
AK Sharma

**( ARUN PALLI )**  
**JUDGE**

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Whether speaking / reasoned: | YES |
| Whether Reportable:          | NO  |