

Civil Writ Petition No. 4382 of 2020

Date of Decision: February 17, 2020

Assistant Executive Engineer, Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and
anotherpetitioners

Versus

Kanwar Kanwaljit Singh Herrrespondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILLPresent: Mr. G.S. Ghuman, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Lisa Gill, J.

The petitioners are aggrieved of award dated 05.08.2019 to the extent that the requisite expense for restoring electricity connection of the tubewell in khasra No. 9/21 has not been quantified.

Brief facts necessary for the adjudication of the case are that a tubewell connection was installed on an application of respondent No. 1, in khasra No. 9/22. However, it came to light that the electricity connection was to be installed in khasra No. 9/21 which was owned by respondent No.1 and not in khasra No. 9/22. The electricity connection was, accordingly, disconnected by the present petitioners.

An application under Section 22(C) of the Legal Services Authority Act was filed by respondent No. 1 seeking directions to the present petitioners for transfer of the electric connection from khasra No. 9/22 to khasra No. 9/21. It is explained by respondent No. 1 that this problem arose due to the absence of the boundary (Watt) between the said khasra numbers. The applicant further undertook that he would be responsible for any expenses, which would be incurred for the restoration and for any legal charges etc. as well.

When mediation between the parties was not possible, learned Permanent Lok Adalat directed the restoration of the electricity connection for the tubewell to be installed in khasra No. 9/21 while making it clear that applicant/respondent No. 1 would bear all the requisite expenses for this restoration including the expense for installation of the poles, if necessary, as well as for laying of the electricity lines besides other ancillary expenses.

Learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to point out anything on record to indicate that any objection has been raised by respondent No. 1 in respect to this direction. In this view of the matter, the present writ petition merely seeking specific quantification of the expenses is uncalled for, especially in the wake of the categorical observation of the learned Permanent Lok Adalat to the effect that the applicant-respondent No. 1 shall be wholly responsible for the entire expenses which may be incurred for said restoration.

No other argument has been addressed.

In this view of the matter, this writ petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

February 17, 2020
rts

(Lisa Gill)
Judge

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