

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-PIL-25-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision:- 17.08.2023

Brig. Raj Bakhsh Singh

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Chandigarh Administration through its Advisor to Administrator,
U.T., Chandigarh and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE**
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Jatin Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Partap Atma Ram, Advocate (amicus-curiae).

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate,
with Mr. Kunal Mulwani, Advocate (amicus-curiae).

Mr. Anil Mehta, Senior Standing Counsel,
with Mr. Rohit Kaushik, Advocate,
for the Union Territory, Chandigarh.

Mr. Satya Pal Jain, Additional Solicitor General of India,
with Mr. Dheeraj Jain, Advocate,
for the Union of India.

Mr. Akshit Chaudhary, Advocate,
for respondent No. 3.

* * * *

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

Though as per previous orders passed by this Court, the documents as required to be filed by the Union Territory, Chandigarh have not been filed and the objections raised by the petitioner in the present writ petition still remain to be considered and decided by the Union Territory, Chandigarh, however, looking to the fact that the matter was taken up suo-motu by this Court, whereafter this writ petition was filed as public interest litigation and that a contingency plan has been prepared by the authorities for the purposes of ensuring uninterrupted electricity supply to the citizens in case of similar contingencies that required this Court to take suo-motu action, we do not deem it appropriate to delve into the issue any further. However, the suggestions and objections raised by the petitioner in the writ petition need to be considered by the Union Territory, Chandigarh while finalizing its contingency plan.

Learned senior standing counsel, appearing for the Union Territory, Chandigarh, submits that all the objections and suggestions raised by

the petitioner would be considered by the authorities. He further submits that the authorities would also, if so required, grant an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner and thereafter would consider and finalize the contingency plan.

In view of the aforesaid statement made by learned senior standing counsel for the Union Territory, Chandigarh, the writ petition stands disposed of in terms thereof.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

17.08.2023
Amodh Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No