

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR-1912 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.09.2022

Dr. R.K.Jain

..Petitioner

Versus

The Sub Divisional Officer (OPN) DHBVNL, Jind.

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Dr. R.K.Jain, petitioner in person.

Mr. Vishal Garg, Advocate,
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

The plaintiff assails the correctness of the order passed by the trial Court while directing him to pay the ad valorem court fee on the amount claimed in the suit. Challenging its correctness, this revision petition has been filed.

The plaintiff while filing the suit has made the following prayers:-

“A. *Compensation for losses to Equipment/Medicines/Gadget/Appliances suffered on 01.05.2012:- As per plaintiff, he suffered loss to the tune of Rs.1,72,030/- on 01.05.2012 due to low voltage and voltage fluctuations, which accrues as on 01.06.2021 to Rs.7,84,373/-. The detail has been furnished in the plaint.*

- B. *Compensation for livelihood losses suffered till date:- On account of being engaged mentally and physically in exposing defendants for their illegal acts and criminal misconduct for last nine years, an amount at least Rs.9,00,000/-.*
- C. *Compensation for nervous, in terms of pronouncements of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:- An amount of Rs.5,00,000/- at least is most just and reasonable amount in the facts and circumstances for the harassment since 2012.*
- D. *Losses suffered on account of second 3 KV commercial meter installed in good faith:-Dual bills compelled to be paid 01.02.2003 to 31.08.2010 at least Rs.90,000/-.*
- E. *Realistic costs under various heads:- For filing and pursuing complaint appeal before the Electricity Consumer Forum and ombudsman at Chandigarh, an amount of Rs.6400/-."*

It is evident that the petitioner claims recovery of a definite amount.

In view of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in **State of Punjab and others vs. Dev Brat Sharma, (Civil Appeal No(s).2064 of 2022(arising out of SLP (Civil) No.(s) 12468 of 2018, decided on 16.03.2022,** the plaintiff is required to deposit the ad valorem court fee.

Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

Dismissed.

Since the revision petition is pending in this Court, the

petitioner is granted 6 weeks time to make good the deficiency.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

September 30, 2022
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

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