

**CWP No. 19391 of 2020,
CWP No. 5181 of 2021 and
CWP No. 16724 of 2021**

-1-

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

**(1). CWP No. 19391 of 2020
Date of Decision: October 25, 2021**

KEWAL GARG @ KEWAL KRISHAN Petitioner(s)
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Respondent(s)

(2). CWP No. 5181 of 2021

RAVINDER SINGH AND OTHERS Petitioner(s)
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Respondent(s)

(3). CWP No. 16724 of 2021

ASHOK GARG Petitioner(s)
Versus

UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL

Present: Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Keshav Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CWP Nos.19391 of 2020 & 1581
of 2021).

Mr. Mandeep Singh Bedi, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Gagan Deep Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. R. Kartikeya, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CWP-16724-2021).

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Addl. Solicitor General of India with
Ms. Neha Sharma, Advocate for respondent no.1 (in CWP
Nos.5181 of 2021 & 19391 of 2020).

Mr. T.P.S. Chawla, D.A.G., Punjab,
for respondents no.2 and 3 (in CWP Nos.5181 of 2021 &
19391 of 2020).

Mr. Rajiv Atma Ram, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. I.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent no.4 (in CWP Nos.5181 of 2021 & 19391
of 2020).

LISA GILL, J.

This order shall dispose of CWP-19391-2020, CWP-1581-2021 and CWP-16724-2021, as challenge in all the writ petitions is to orders dated 22.10.2020 and 09.11.2020, passed by respondent no.3 – Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali.

Petitioners in all these writ petitions are aggrieved of laying down of 220 KV Double Circuit Transmission Line in village Mukarakpur, Dera Bassi, Mohali, Punjab. Petitioner in CWP-19391-2020 is the owner of the land over which the transmission line is allegedly being laid. It is further alleged that he is running a brick kiln on this land. CWP-5181-2021 has been filed by petitioners, who claimed to be the workers at the brick kiln or family members of the workers at the brick kiln owned by the petitioner in CWP-19391-2020. CWP-16724-2021 filed at a much later stage by another land owner in village Mubarakpur, raising the same pleas as in the other two writ petitions, came up for urgent hearing when the other two writ petitions were ripe for arguments. As the issue involved is identical and learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to point out any distinguishing feature, which calls for a separate reply from the respondents for proper adjudication of the matter, said writ petition is also being decided along with.

For the sake of convenience, facts are being extracted from CWP-19391-2020 i.e. the writ petition, which has been filed by petitioner Kewal Garg alias Kewal Krishan, owner of a brick kiln, which is stated to be running since the past 35 years with all requisite permissions and approvals from the concerned authorities. It is further stated that a large number of workers' residential premises have been constructed in the vicinity of the area where the brick kiln is situated. Approval was accorded to respondent no.4 – Power Grid Corporation by the Ministry of Power i.e. Central Electricity Authority under Section 68 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for “Establishment of 200/66 K.V., 2x16 MVA GIS substation at UT Chandigarh along with 220 KV D/C line from Chandigarh GIS substation to 400/220 KV Panchkula (Powergrid) substation”. Thereafter, notice dated 13.07.2017 (Annexure P-3) was published in various newspapers by respondent no.4. Petitioner Kewal Krishan as well as the labour/workers at the brick kiln, apprehending threat to their life, requested the State authorities including the Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali – respondent no.3 to examine the matter. At the same time, Power Grid Corporation sought orders under Section 10 read with Section 15 of the Telegraph Act, 1885. Petitioner claims that the District Magistrate, SAS Nagar, Mohali, vide communication dated 11.01.2018 (Annexure P-6), passed a final order observing that as the brick kiln has been in operation since 1990 and huts of the labourers are in existence at the spot and as per guidelines of Punjab State Power Corporation Limited (for short 'PSPCL'),

transmission line should be at a distance of 500 meters, therefore the transmission line may be realigned as per second of the three surveys conducted. This was duly replied to, by the Power Grid Corporation vide communication dated 22.01.2018 (Annexure P-7). A committee was thereafter formed to resolve the matter. Report dated 26.06.2018 (Annexure P-10) was submitted for a final decision to be taken by Deputy Commissioner, Mohali. Matter was conveyed to the Additional Chief Secretary vide communication dated 01.08.2018 (Annexure P-11). Power Grid Corporation filed CWP-32701-2018, which was however, withdrawn on 16.09.2020 (Annexure P14), as during pendency of the writ petition, various meetings were held by the Power Grid Corporation with senior officials of the Government of Punjab and concerned agencies and the matter was stated to be resolved. Thereafter, the petitioner was called for hearing before the Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali. Representation on behalf of petitioners was also submitted. Ultimately, impugned orders dated 22.10.2020 (Annexure P-18) and 09.11.2020 (Annexure P-19) were passed after considering all the objections raised by the petitioners. Aggrieved therefrom CWP-19391-2020 was filed at the first instance, followed by CWP-5181-2021 and ultimately CWP-16724-2021 came up for hearing when the other two writ petitions were listed for arguments.

Learned counsel for the petitioners in CWP-19391 of 2020 and 5181 of 2021 had vehemently argued that the impugned orders are illegal,

arbitrary, unreasonable, in contravention and in violation of the provisions of law and principles of natural justice, causing manifest and grave injustice to the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that first and foremost no opportunity of hearing was provided to the petitioner. Public notice dated 15.07.2017 does not even find mention of the village Mubarakpur. Therefore, it is clearly illegal to erect or construct any towers or lay down any transmission lines in this village. It is further submitted that laying of transmission lines over residential premises of the workers of the brick kiln is absolutely illegal and arbitrary and can lead to a major disaster. Learned counsel for the petitioner also argued with equal vehemence that once having taken a final decision regarding illegality of laying of the transmission lines, it is not open to the Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali to take a U-turn and pass the impugned order. It is submitted that it amounts to review of its earlier order which is not permissible and is in complete derogation and violation of the settled principles of law. Learned counsel for the petitioner further referred to Regulation 65 of the Central Electricity Authority (Measures relating to Safety and Electrical Supply) Regulations, 2010, to submit that any transmission line of 220 KV, which has to be laid, should be at a distance of 500 meters from a brick kiln and admittedly in the present case, distance of the transmission line from the existing brick kiln is much less. Learned counsel for the petitioner in CWP-16724-2020 has raised similar arguments. It is this prayed that these writ petitions be allowed.

Learned counsel for respondent no.4 while refuting the arguments raised on behalf of the petitioners submits that work in question has been correctly undertaken by the Power Grid Corporation of India in complete consonance with the provisions of law. The petitioners, it is submitted are merely trying to stall the work, which is of national importance. It is submitted that out of the total 56 transmission towers, which are to be erected, 51 towers already stand raised and it is only 5 towers which remain to be raised and the project has been unnecessarily stalled. The third writ petition which has been filed now, it is submitted, is a clear cut attempt to somehow delay the proceedings. Learned counsel for respondent no.4 submits that prior approval for the project was accorded to the Power Grid Corporation by the Government of India under Section 68 of the Electricity Act, 2003. It is argued that the matter was in fact never finally adjudicated by the District Magistrate at any point of time, as is asserted by the petitioners. The matter was always under active consideration even during the pendency of CWP-32701-2018, filed by Power Grid Corporation. Therefore, to say that there has been a review of any order by the District Magistrate, is incorrect. In so far as the question of inviting of objections is concerned, learned counsel for respondent no.4 while referring to provisions of Section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Power Grid Corporation of India Vs. Century Textiles and Industries Ltd., 2017 AIR (SC) 1141, Harbans Singh Vs. Punjab State Transmission Corporation Ltd. 2018 (1) PLR 604*** and

Gurmukh Singh Vs. Punjab State Power Corporation Ltd. 2019 (2) PLR 388, submits that there is no requirement for inviting of objections before carrying on with the project. It is further submitted that publication of notice/s in various newspapers, is a matter of record. In view of the specific statutory provisions, requirement of hearing of objections cannot be read into procedure as is suggested by petitioners on the basis of the documents attached with the replication filed by petitioners. Learned counsel for respondent no.4 while referring to certain photographs taken via satellite, points out that the shed on the premises of petitioner in CWP-19391-2020 was completed during pendency of this writ petition. However, no transmission lines cross over this shed. The temporary huts over which transmission lines cross over, would be relocated at the cost of respondent no.4 and that due care and caution alongwith all safety measures would be put in place in accordance with law. It is further submitted, this project of national importance has already been stalled needlessly with only about 10% of the work left to be completed. It is thus prayed that all the writ petitions be dismissed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the files with their able assistance.

It is a matter of record that the Power Grid Corporation is a Central Transmission Utility and a Central Transmission Utility is a deemed licensee under the 2nd proviso to Section 14 of the Electricity Act. Power Grid Corporation is also treated as an authority under the Indian Telegraph

Act, 1885. As per the provisions of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, unobstructed access to lay down telegraph and or electricity transmission lines is provided. Section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003 reads as under:-

Section 164. (Exercise of powers of Telegraph Authority in certain cases):-

The Appropriate Government may, by order in writing, for the placing of electric lines or electrical plant for the transmission of electricity or for the purpose of telephonic or telegraphic communications necessary for the proper co-ordination of works, confer upon any public officer, licensee or any other person engaged in the business of supplying electricity under this Act, subject to such conditions and restrictions, if any, as the Appropriate Government may think fit to impose and to the provisions of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, any of the powers which the telegraph authority possesses under that Act with respect to the placing of telegraph lines and posts for the purposes of a telegraph established or maintained, by the Government or to be so established or maintained.

In the present case, it is a matter of record that necessary prior approval was afforded to the Power Grid Corporation of India on 04/06.01.2016 for establishment of the sub-station and laying down of the lines in question. After publication of the notice dated 13.07.2017 (Annexure P-3), dispute had arisen with the owner of the brick kiln and the workers thereon objecting to the laying of the said transmission lines. Matter was under consideration of the State authorities. Perusal of various

documents attached with the writ petitions, including the reports dated 22.06.2018 (Annexure P-9) and 26.06.2018 (Annexure P-10) as well as communication dated 01.08.2018 (Annexure P-11) reveal that a final decision on the matter had in fact not been taken. The view expressed was that route of transmission line was in violation of clearance as it was passing very near the brick kiln against requirement of 500 meters, as normally in Punjab, a minimum of 100 meters clearance is maintained, along with some other observations. The matter came up before this High Court in CWP-32701-2018 being filed by the Power Grid Corporation of India. Said writ petition was ultimately withdrawn on 16.09.2020, on a specific application being filed with the averments that with intervention of senior officials of the Punjab Government, meetings were being held and matter was likely to be concluded. It is thereafter that an opportunity of hearing was admittedly afforded to the petitioner and impugned orders dated 22.10.2020 and 09.11.2020 were passed. The objections raised by the petitioners were duly noted by the District Magistrate, SAS Nagar, Mohali, which are as under :-

- i. PGCIL notified the Villages of Sanouli and Pandwala mentioned in the Public Notice at Sr. No. 9 and 10. Public Notice published in "The Tribune" on 15.07.2017. The village Mubarakpur was not notified and as such, it is illegal to erect towers in that village.*
- ii. The line cannot cross above a working unit of the Brick Kiln, with labourers on site and put their lives at risk as their temporary hut falls directly under the line.*

iii. An alternate route/Right of Way (ROW) is available along the NALA/Barsati Drain, which may require one or two foundation as 12/17 meter pile foundation. This alternative route is shorter also as per the report of PSTCL.

iv. PGCIL can lay underground cable. '

In my considered opinion, all the said objections have been correctly dealt with by the District Magistrate, SAS Nagar, Mohali, for the reasons as delineated in the following paras. Vide order dated 09.11.2020, objections raised by the petitioners in respect to Regulations 61 and 65 of the Central Electricity Authority (Measures relating to Safety and Electrical Supply) Regulations, 2010, have been succinctly dealt with as well.

At this stage, it is pertinent to refer to Regulation 61 and 65 of the Central Electricity Authority (Measures relating to Safety and Electrical Supply) Regulations, 2010, which are detailed as under:-

61. Clearances from buildings of lines of voltage exceeding 650 V.-

(1) An overhead line shall not cross over an existing building as far as possible and no building shall be constructed under an existing overhead line.

(2) Where an overhead line of voltage exceeding 650 V passes above or adjacent to any building or part of a building it shall have on the basis of maximum sag a vertical clearance above the highest part of the building immediately under such line, of not less than-

(i) for lines of voltages exceeding 650 Volts up to and including 33,000 Volts - 3.7 metres

(ii) for lines of voltages exceeding 33 KV - 3.7 metres plus 0.30 metre for every additional 33,000 Volts or part thereof.

(3) The horizontal clearance between the nearest conductor and any part of such building shall, on the basis of maximum deflection due to wind pressure, be not less than-

(i) for lines of voltages exceeding 650 V up to and including 11,000 Volts - 1.2 metres

(ii) for lines of voltages exceeding 11,000 V and up to and including 33,000 V - 2.0 metres

(iii) for lines of voltages exceeding 33 KV - 2.0 metres plus 0.3 metre

fore every additional 33kV or part thereof.
(4) For High Voltage Direct Current (HVDC) systems, vertical clearance and horizontal clearance, on the basis of maximum deflection due to wind pressure, from buildings shall be maintained as below:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>DC Voltage (KV)</i>	<i>Vertical Clearance (mtrs.)</i>	<i>Horizontal Clearance (mtrs.)</i>
<i>1.</i>	<i>100 KV</i>	<i>4.6</i>	<i>2.9</i>
<i>2.</i>	<i>200 KV</i>	<i>5.8</i>	<i>4.1</i>
<i>3.</i>	<i>300 KV</i>	<i>7.0</i>	<i>5.3</i>
<i>4.</i>	<i>400 KV</i>	<i>7.9</i>	<i>6.2</i>
<i>5.</i>	<i>500 KV</i>	<i>9.1</i>	<i>7.4</i>
<i>6.</i>	<i>600 KV</i>	<i>10.3</i>	<i>8.6</i>
<i>7.</i>	<i>800 KV</i>	<i>12.4</i>	<i>10.7</i>

(5) Vertical and horizontal clearances shall be as specified in schedule-X.
Explanation: - For the purpose of this regulation the expression "building" shall be deemed to include any structure, whether permanent or temporary.

65. General clearances. –

- (1) For the purpose of. computing the vertical clearance of an overhead line, the maximum sag of any conductor shall be calculated on the basis of the maximum sag in still air and the maximum temperature as specified under regulations 57 and computing any horizontal clearance of an overhead line the maximum deflection of any conductor shall be calculated on the basis of the wind pressure specified under regulations 57.*
- (2) No blasting for any purpose shall be done within 300 metres from the boundary of a sub-station or from the electric supply lines of voltage exceeding 650 V or tower structure thereof without the written permission of the owner of such sub-station or electric supply lines or tower structures and in case of mining lease hold area, without the written permission of the Inspector of Mines.*
- (3) No cutting of soil within ten meters from the tower structure of 132 KV and above voltage level shall be permitted without the written permission of the owner of tower structure.*
- (4) No person shall construct brick kiln or other polluting units near the installations or transmission lines of 220 KV and above within a distance of 500 metres.*

Much stress has been laid by learned counsel for the petitioners on Regulation 65(4) to submit that distance of the transmission line from the brick kiln is less than 500 meters which is impermissible. It is pertinent to note that it is Regulation 61, which would deal with the present situation and not Regulation 65(4), as Regulation 65(4) deals with a situation where a person has to construct or erect a brick kiln or any other polluting unit near an existing transmission line. In the present case, the brick kiln is admittedly existing on the spot, therefore, it is Regulation 61, which shall hold the field. It is specifically mentioned in the impugned orders that Regulation 61 has been complied with. Learned counsel for respondent no.4 has further assured that due care and caution would be taken to ensure that all safety measures are in place and furthermore extra caution has been exercised in this case as more than required distance in terms of Regulation 61 is being maintained with polymer insulation being used to ensure safety of the line instead of the old technology.

The apprehension that petitioner would have to close down his brick kiln, has been dealt with and said apprehension assuaged, while noting that the Power Grid Corporation has given in writing that if required by the concerned authorities, it shall provide a 'No Objection Certificate' (N.O.C.), for continuation of operation of brick kiln or renewal of the license. Accordingly, order dated 22.10.2020 was reiterated.

I do not find any merit in the argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioners that there has been review of an earlier decision

taken by the Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali, while passing the impugned orders. It is borne out from the record that on earlier occasion, a final view or decision had not yet been taken. Report of the Committee expressing the opinion was submitted for final decision, which was yet to be arrived at. Therefore, there is no question of any review of an earlier decision taken by the District Magistrate.

At this stage, it is gainful to refer to the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd. Vs. Century Textiles and Industries Ltd.*** (supra), wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clearly observed that the Power Grid Corporation is treated as an authority under the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 and it acquires all such powers which are vested in a telegraph authority under the provisions of the Telegraph Act, including power to eliminate any obstruction in the laying of the power transmission lines and unobstructed access to any property for that purpose which is imperative in the larger public interest. It is further held that the legislature has not permitted any kind of impediment or obstruction in achieving this objective and through scheme of the Telegraph Act empowering the licensee to lay telegraph lines, applied the same, as it is, for laying the electricity transmission lines. Hon'ble Supreme Court further held that while acquiring power to lay the telegraph lines, there is no acquisition of any right other than that of user in the property but it has to be ensured that the exercise causes as little damage as possible and that compensation has to be paid to the interested persons for any damage

sustained by them. Furthermore, Rule 3(1) of the Works of the Licensees Rules 2006, ceases to apply in the case of Power Grid Corporation by virtue of execution clause contained in Rule 3(4) and Section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Division Bench of this High Court in *Harbans Singh's* case (supra) has categorically held that the only right available to the landowners is to receive compensation or damages, if any sustained by them by laying down of the transmission lines as there is neither any acquisition of land nor requirement of any consent of the owners or occupiers. The Division Bench in the case of *Harban Singh's* case (supra) negated the plea that petitioners therein had not been granted proper opportunity to raise issues or make suggestions to the authorities regarding alternative or shorter routes which may have been available. Similar is the decision in *Gurmukh Singh's* case (supra).

In the factual matrix of the case, I also do not find any merit in the argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioners that as village Mubarakpur is not mentioned in notice dated 13.07.2017, the entire process is vitiated. It is relevant to note at this stage that in the case of Gurmukh Singh (supra), name of one of the villages was not mentioned in the notice, which was published. The Court had refused to interfere on this ground.

In the present case, relevant part of the notice 13.07.2017 reads as under:-

“For the purposes of laying and maintaining the electric lines or

electrical plant under, over, along or across any immovable property the Ministry of Power, Government of India vide Gazette notification no.1148 dated December 24, 2003 under section 164 of the Electricity Act, 2003 has conferred on and authorized POWERGRID as per law, to exercise all those powers that are possessed by and vested in a 'Telegraph Authority' under part-III of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 with respect to placing and maintaining of a telegraph line.

The said Transmission Line shall pass through, over, under along or across the lands/immovable property **in and around the area of and/or between the villages, mentioned here-in-below, in or upon which** POWERGRID shall have power to use the land and/or **immovable property** for the purposes of establishment of the said Transmission Line and maintenance thereof. (emphasise is added)

Sl. No.	UT/State	District(s)	Tehsil (S)	Name of Village(s)	Remarks
1.	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Hallomajra	Underground cable
2.	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Dariya	Underground cable
3.	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Makhan Majra	Underground cable
4.	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Chandigarh	Raipur Kurd	Underground cable
5.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Mohali	Dera Bassi	Baltana	Underground cable
6.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Mohali	Dera Bassi	Zirakpur	Underground cable

7.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Dera Bassi Mohali	Gazi Pur	Overhead Line	
8.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Dera Bassi Mohali	Nagla	Overhead Line	
9.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Dera Bassi Mohali	Sanauli	Overhead Line	
10.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Dera Bassi Mohali	Pandanwala	Overhead Line	
11.	Punjab	SAS Nagar Dera Bassi Mohali	Sundran	Overhead Line	
12.	Haryana	Panchkula	Panchkula	Bhanun	Overhead Line
13.	Haryana	Panchkula	Panchkula	Bir Firojri	Overhead Line
14.	Haryana	Panchkula	Panchkula	Nagla	Overhead Line
15.	Haryana	Panchkula	Panchkula	Jalauli	Overhead Line”

It is not disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners that village Mubarakpur which admittedly falls in Tehsil and District Dera Bassi, lies between village Pandanwala and Nagla, which are duly mentioned in this notice. Learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to point out as to how the judgments in the case of Harbans Singh and Gurmukh Singh or the Power Grid Corporation of India Vs. Century Textiles and Industries Ltd. (supra) are per incurium, as is sought to be urged. In my considered opinion present controversy is covered on all fours against the petitioners by the said decisions. It is pertinent to note at this stage that the Union of India has taken a categoric stand supporting the stance of the Power Grid Corporation as has the state administration. Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Learned Additional Solicitor General, categorically states that Union of India supports the stand taken by the Power Grid Corporation, therefore, reference by learned

counsel for the petitioners to communication dated 01.08.2013 from Under Secretary to the Government of India, attached with the replication, is of no avail to the petitioners. As per communication dated 01.08.2013, it was desired that Power Grid Corporation shall follow the procedure of taking into consideration objections/representations submitted by any interested person regarding route of the Scheme pursuant to publication of the notice in two local daily newspapers, before finalizing the optimal route alignment and that record of such objections/representations received along with action taken to resolve the objections, should be retained. In the written statement filed on behalf of respondent no.4 in CWP-5181-2021, it is specifically stated that such a communication is an internal communication and is not mandatory. There is no such rule or regulation which calls for a mandate as prayed for. It is a matter of record that said communication was in existence at the time of passing of orders in the ***Power Grid Corporation of India Vs. Century Textile and Industries Ltd., Harbans Singh and Gurmukh Singh's*** (supra) and as mentioned above, Union of India has categorically supported the stand of Power Grid Corporation of India, therefore, these writ petitions are squarely covered by the decisions in the abovesaid cases.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for respondent no.4 also submitted that temporary huts raised by the labourers/workers at the brick kiln can be shifted to any other place within the premises at cost which shall be borne by respondent no.4.

Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any ground whatsoever to interfere in the present writ petitions. Respondent no.4 is well within its rights to lay down transmission lines as proposed. It is a matter of record that ninety percent (90%) of the work stands completed i.e. 51 of the 56 towers have been raised. Unnecessary hindrance in provision of much required infrastructure has to be avoided while ensuring that all safety measures are in place. Orders dated 22.10.2020 and 09.11.2020, have been correctly passed by the Deputy Commissioner, SAS Nagar, Mohali. Needless to say, transmission lines shall not be laid down before relocation of the temporary huts of the labourers/workers on the spot, to be facilitated by the Power Grid Corporation, though this order cannot by any stretch of imagination be taken to allow the labourers to obstruct their relocation. Petitioners shall be entitled to seek compensation, if any, in accordance with the provisions of law.

These writ petitions are accordingly dismissed with no order as to cost.

October 25, 2021

Sunil

**(Lisa Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No