

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

**CWP No. 37098 of 2019
Date of Decision: 19.12.2019**

Jagtar Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

NRSS XXXI (B) Transmission limited and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Rakesh K. Kaundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J. (Oral)

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to explain how a writ is maintainable against a Public Limited Company and its Project Manager arrayed as the two respondents. Moreover, there is no impugned order placed on record which is requirement is normally necessary to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court for certiorari and mandamus. The only document referred to by the petitioner in his support is Annex. P-10 which is a reply dated 7.10.2019 of Sh. Kamal Kumar Gupta, Advocate for ASA Legal Services LLP addressed to Mr. N.S. Dhillon, Advocate, who is also counsel for the petitioner in this case generating litigation work. This is not a legal document on which would neither a certiorari nor a mandamus issue commanding the respondents to act in a particular way or can be claimed as a matter of right. Besides, it is also not clear from the file as to what the petitioner

actually is looking for in terms of relief except that he wants his tubewell with the connection shifted from the existing spot to another part of his land which may not fall under the high tension transmission line commissioned under the Build, Operate, Maintain mode with aa agreement with the supplier of energy.

2. Accordingly, this petition fails and is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to either file a fresh petition which is *ex facie* maintainable by clearly stating the cause of action and the specific grievance which has impelled him to approach this Court or better still he may seek such remedies in the alternative, as are available to him under the law.

(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE

19.12.2019

kv

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