

IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH

219

CWP-6783-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 15.09.2023

MAYA DEVI

... Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Parmod Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Chauhan, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.4.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

The present petition has been filed for seeking release of tube-well connection in favour of the petitioner, which is very necessary for irrigating the crops.

At the time of issuing notice of motion, it was specifically noticed that the petitioner has already preferred a petition before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of the respondent-Distribution Licensee, however, no decision has been taken thereupon till date. The matter has been taken up on two occasions thereafter, however, the respondent-Distribution Licensee has neither chosen to convey any instructions to its counsel nor did it apprise about the status of the pending petition before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum. The position remains the same even today as well.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that at this stage, the petitioner would be satisfied if the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum is directed to decide the pending petition filed by the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the respondent-Distribution Licensee has no objection to the same.

Accordingly, with the consent of the parties and without commenting anything on the merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum of the respondent-Distribution Licensee to take a decision on the pending petition filed by the petitioner in a time bound manner and preferably within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the respective parties.

At the same time, this Court expresses its displeasure at the conduct of the officials of DHBVN, Office at Safidon and, hence, costs of Rs.10,000/- is imposed upon the officials for having failed to respond to the repeated notices issued by this Court as well as the communications sent by the counsel for the respondent-Distribution Licensee. Costs be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Jind.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2023*rajender***(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No**Whether reportable : Yes/No*