

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

153

CWP-25037-2023
Date of decision: 06.11.2023

RAMESHWARA HOSPITALS PVT LTDPetitioner

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY CHANDIGARH AND OTHERSRespondents

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

Present: - Mr. Puneet Bali, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Vipul Joshi, Advocate,
Mr. Prashant Kumar Kapila, Advocate
Ms. Razwal Singh Purewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Mittal, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Himanshu Gupta, Advocate,
Ms. Shifali Goyal, Advocate,
Mr. Ritvik Garg, Advocate and
Mr. Tejinder Joshi, Advocate
for respondents.

Mr. Aman Bahri, Advocate and
Ms. Aashna Gill, Advocate
for the respondent-U.T. Chandigarh.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present petition is to the order dated
21.09.2023 (Annexure P-5) passed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal
Forum, U.T. Chandigarh in Complaint No. E-111/2023 dated 29.08.2023
*titled “Atulaya Healthcare Pvt. Ltd. versus Department of Engineering,
Chandigarh Administration and others”* as well as the order dated
31.10.2023 (Annexure P-12) passed by the Electricity Ombudsman for the
State of Goa and Union Territories.

2. The controversy in the present case has now been confined only to the usage of the Transformer that has been installed in the premises on the roof top thereof.

3. Counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the petitioner shall remove the Transformer only from the premises within a period of 02 weeks whereupon the respondent may install his own transformer/electrical equipment to energise the premises at his own cost. The petitioner shall not create any impediment in the process of installation of the electrical infrastructure for ensuring supply of electricity to the premises in question. The present arrangement is without prejudice to the respective rights of the parties to pursue their alternative remedies. The petitioner shall not create any impediment in facilitating release of the electricity connection at the behest of the respondent himself by installing his infrastructure.

4. At the same time, counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that the respondent-Electricity Ombudsman had no jurisdiction to decide the issue and they have no objection in case the order passed by the Electricity Ombudsman is set aside.

5. Ordered accordingly.

6. The order passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, U.T. Chandigarh is modified in view of the consent of the parties recorded herein above.

The petition is disposed of.

NOVEMBER 06, 2023

Vishal Sharma

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No