



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 19.08.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ

W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

K.Elangamani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chairman,
TANGEDCO,
Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 003.

2.The District Collector,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.

3.The Divisional Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Valliyoor,
Tirunelveli District.

4.The Superintending Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Maharaja Nagar,
Tirunelveli – 11.

5.The Inspector of Police,
Panagudi Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

WEB COPY

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pay compensation for the death of the petitioner's wife namely, Chellammal who is aged about 60 years and a costly cow of Rs.50,000/- totalling a sum of Rs.30,50,000/- with subsequent interest to the petitioner forthwith.

For Petitioner	: Mr.S.Palani Velayutham
For R-1, R-3 and R-4	: Mr.S.Deenadhayalan Standing Counsel
For R-2	: Mr.R.Suresh Kumar Additional Government Pleader
For R-5	: Mr.Vaikkam Karunanithi Government Advocate

ORDER

The present Writ Petition is filed praying for a Mandamus, directing the respondents to pay compensation to the petitioner on account of death of his wife viz., Chellammal and also the cow, to the tune of Rs.30,50,000/- with interest.



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

WEB COPY

2. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner's wife namely, Chellammal and her cow got electrocuted and died on 20.05.2016, while she went along with her cow for grazing to the agricultural land. In this regard, the petitioner's son made a complaint before the Panagudi Police Station, based on which a case was registered in Crime No.192 of 2016 under Section 174 of Cr.P.C. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 15.05.2017 to the authorities seeking for compensation on account of death of his wife as well as cow due to electrocution. Since no action was taken, the present petition is filed.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the accident occurred only due to the negligence of the respondent Board. If the Board had taken due care and had not been negligent in installing/maintaining the electric post, the accident would not have occurred at all. It was further submitted that the petitioner does not have any employment or income from any other source. After the demise of his wife, he has been living alone and finding it extremely difficult to make both ends meet. That the respondents are liable to compensate the petitioner not only for the monetary loss but also for loss of love and



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

affection and the mental agony suffered. That the responsibility of supplying electric energy in that locality was statutorily cast on the respondents and if energy so transmitted causes injury or death, the primary liability to compensate is on the supplier of electric energy.

4. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the fourth respondent that prior to the day of the alleged occurrence, due to heavy rain and wind, the coconut branch fallen on the live electric wire, in which the electric line snapped and fallen down. On 20.05.2016, when the deceased along with her cow went for grazing, her cow stepped on the live electric wire and got electrocuted, while so, the petitioner's wife touched the cow and she also got electrocuted. Therefore, there was no negligent on the part of the respondents. Hence, the petitioner instead of approaching this Court, ought to have file a civil suit.

5. Heard the learned counsels on both sides and perused the materials on record.



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

WEB COPY

6. Actions in tort and negligence are first required to be established by the petitioner/claimant. Mere fact that the claimant had suffered loss as a result of coming in contact with a live service wire by itself may not render the Board liable for compensation. It is trite law that while dealing with the claim of compensation or tort as a result of action of tort or negligence, Courts are required to examine whether the injury is caused by the negligence of the defendants/respondent and the respondent ought to be provided with an opportunity to prove that the injury cannot be attributed to negligence on its part. Those are normally disputed questions of fact, which fall outside the realm of Article 226. In this regard, it may be relevant to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***SDO, Grid Corporation of Orissa Limited and others Vs. Timudu Oram*** reported in (2005) 6 SCC 156, wherein, it was held as under:

"6. In Chairman, Grid Corpn. of Orissa Ltd. (GRIDCO) [(1999) 7 SCC 298] with which case these appeals were listed for hearing but could not be heard for want of service, this Court took the view that the High Court committed an error in entertaining the writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution and were not fit cases for exercising the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. It was held that actions in tort and negligence were required to be



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

established initially by the claimants. The mere fact that the wire of electric transmission line belonging to the appellants had snapped and the deceased had come into contact with it and died by itself was not sufficient for awarding compensation. The Court was required to examine as to whether the wire had snapped as a result of any negligence on the part of the appellants, as a result of which the deceased had come in contact with the wire. In view of the defence raised and the denial by the appellants in each of the cases, the appellants deserved an opportunity to prove that proper care and precautions were taken in maintaining the transmission line and yet the wires had snapped because of the circumstances beyond their control or unauthorised intervention of third parties. Such disputed questions of fact could not be decided in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. That the High Court could not come to the conclusion that the defence raised by the appellants had been raised only for the sake of it and there was no substance in it. In para 6 it was observed thus: (SCC pp. 301-02)

“6. In our opinion, the High Court committed an error in entertaining the writ petitions even though they were not fit cases for exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution. The High Court went wrong in proceeding on the basis that as the deaths had taken place because of electrocution as a result of the deceased coming into contact with snapped live wires of the electric transmission lines of the appellants, that ‘admittedly/prima facie amounted to negligence on the part of the appellants’. The High Court



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

failed to appreciate that all these cases were actions in tort and negligence was required to be established firstly by the claimants. The mere fact that the wire of the electric transmission line belonging to Appellant 1 had snapped and the deceased had come in contact with it and had died was not by itself sufficient for awarding compensation. It also required to be examined whether the wire had snapped as a result of any negligence of the appellants and under which circumstances the deceased had come in contact with the wire. In view of the specific defences raised by the appellants in each of these cases they deserved an opportunity to prove that proper care and precautions were taken in maintaining the transmission lines and yet the wires had snapped because of circumstances beyond their control or unauthorised intervention of third parties or that the deceased had not died in the manner stated by the petitioners. These questions could not have been decided properly on the basis of affidavits only. It is the settled legal position that where disputed questions of facts are involved a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is not a proper remedy. The High Court has not and could not have held that the disputes in these cases were raised for the sake of raising them and that there was no substance therein. The High Court should have directed the writ petitioners to approach the civil court as it was done in OJC No. 5229 of 1995.”

...

9. In the present case, the appellants had disputed the negligence attributed to it and no finding has been recorded by the High Court that GRIDCO was in any way negligent in the



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

performance of its duty. The present case is squarely covered by the decision of this Court in Chairman, Grid Corpn. of Orissa Ltd. (GRIDCO) [(1999) 7 SCC 298] . The High Court has also erred in awarding compensation in Civil Appeal No. 4552 of 2005 [@ SLP (C) No. 9788 of 1998]. The subsequent suit or writ petition would not be maintainable in view of the dismissal of the suit. The writ petition was filed after a lapse of 10 years. No reasons have been given for such an inordinate delay. The High Court erred in entertaining the writ petition after a lapse of 10 years. In such a case, awarding of compensation in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution cannot be justified."

7. Secondly, yet another reason why I would think that the claim for compensation cannot be resolved in a Writ Petition under Article 226, is in view of the fact that even if this Court in exercise of its powers under Article 226, does come to a conclusion that the petitioner is entitled to compensation, however, the measure of damages would depend on variety of factors such as loss of pay, medical expenses, mental and physical sufferings, etc. There is no straight jacket formula and there is no process articulated nor is there any uniform policy which could be applied in determining the measure of damages. Thus, it may not be appropriate for this Court to decide on the entitlement of compensation nor evaluate the measure of damages.



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

8. Having stated that, it is necessary to note that the Board vide proceedings in B.P.No.6 dated 16.10.2019 has enhanced the grant of ex-gratia payment in the case of fatal accidents to Rs.5,00,000/- and in the case of non-fatal accidents to Rs.2,00,000/-. It may be necessary to extract the relevant portion of the Board Proceedings in B.P.No.6 dated 16.10.2019:

“Accident – Compensation payable by TANGEDCO in cases of Fatal/Non-Fatal, Nondepartmental, Mechanical/Electrical accidents to human beings/animals – Enhancement of payment of compensation - Orders – Issued.

(Administrative Branch)

(Per.) (FB) TANGEDCO Proceedings No.6 Dated 16th October 2019.

*Purattasi-29, Vikari Varudam,
Thiruvalluvar Aandu-2050.*

READ:

- 1. (Per.) (FB) TANGEDCO Proceedings No.5, Dated 29.04.2013.*
- 2. Extract from the Minutes of 90th Board Meeting of the TANGEDCO held on 30.09.2019.*

PROCEEDINGS

In modification of the orders issued in the B.P. cited, the TANGEDCO directs that the exgratia payment payable on compassionate grounds in respect of Fatal/Non-fatal, Non-departmental, Mechanical/Electrical accidents to human beings/animals is enhanced as detailed below:-

Sl.No.	Mode of Accident	Existing	Enhanced	Competent Authority
1	For Fatal	Rs.2,00,000/-	Rs.5,00,000/-	



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

2	For No-Fatal a) Loss of two limbs or two eyes b) Loss of one limb or one eye	Rs.1,00,000/-	Rs.2,00,000/- Rs.1,00,000/-	Chief Engineer/ Personnel
3	Animals (Cow/Buffalow/ Bullock)	Rs.10,000/-	Rs.25,000/-	

2. The above enhanced rates of compensation shall be paid to the victims on incidents reported on or after 29.07.2019. Previous closed files need not be reopened.

(By Order of the Board of TANGEDCO)

*A.Ashok Kumar,
Chief Engineer/Personnel.*

TANGEDCO – Bonus and Ex-gratia to Workmen of TANGEDCO or the year 2018-2019 - Orders – Issued.

(Secretariat Branch)

*(Per.) CMD TANGEDCO Proceedings No.189
October2019.*

Dated 16th

*Purattasi-29, Vikari
Varudam,
Thiruvalluvar Aandu-2050.*

READ:

- i) (Per.) FB TANGEDCO Proceedings No.9, (SB) Dated 02.03.2018.*
- ii) G.O.Ms.No.302, Finance (BPE) Department, Dated 26.09.2019.*



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

PROCEEDINGS

The quantum of Bonus and Ex-gratia payable for the financial year 2018-2019 to the Workmen of the TANGEDCO covered by the Wage Settlement has been considered in consultation with Government. The ceiling limit for Rs.3,500/- payment of Bonus and Ex-gratia has been enhanced to Rs.7,000/- as per the Revised Bonus Act 2015. In the reference second cited, the Government have accorded sanction for payment of Bonus and Ex-gratia to the employees of the TANGEDCO. The Government of Tamil Nadu has announced for payment of Bonus and Ex-gratia to the eligible employees of TANGEDCO.”

In my view, the petitioner would be entitled to the above ex-gratia payment of Rs.5,00,000/- and Rs.25,000/- for the death of his wife and cow without having to demonstrate that the accident occurred due to negligence/carelessness on the part of the respondent Board.

9. In this regard, it may be relevant to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Sudesh Dogra v. Union of India*** reported in ***(2014) 6 SCC 486***, wherein, the nature of ex-gratia payment has been explained as under:

“22. The petitioners who are the widows of the victims of the unfortunate incidents of violence have received ex gratia of Rs 1 lakh each both from the State of Jammu and Kashmir and State of Chhattisgarh. Ex gratia is an act of gratis and has no connection with the liability of the State in law. The very nature of the relief and its dispensation by the State cannot be governed by directions in the nature of mandamus unless of course there is an apparent



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

discrimination in the manner of grant of such relief.”

WEB COPY

10. The above ex-gratia is apparently paid by the Board in recognition of the “strict liability” that is cast on it by virtue of undertaking the supply of electricity, which is hazardous and risky. In this regard, it may be relevant to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***M.P.Electricity Board Vs. Shail Kumari and others*** reported in **(2002) 2 SCC 162**, wherein, while dealing with a fatal accident in view of a live wire getting snapped, falling on a public road and a cyclist, who without noticing the same was electrocuted on coming in contact with the said wire and died, it was held as under:

"8. Even assuming that all such measures have been adopted, a person undertaking an activity involving hazardous or risky exposure to human life, is liable under law of torts to compensate for the injury suffered by any other person, irrespective of any negligence or carelessness on the part of the managers of such undertakings. The basis of such liability is the foreseeable risk inherent in the very nature of such activity. The liability cast on such person is known, in law, as “strict liability”. It differs from the liability which arises on account of the negligence or fault in this way i.e. the concept of negligence comprehends that the foreseeable harm could be avoided by taking reasonable precautions. If the defendant did all that which could be done for avoiding the harm he cannot be held liable when



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

the action is based on any negligence attributed. But such consideration is not relevant in cases of strict liability where the defendant is held liable irrespective of whether he could have avoided the particular harm by taking precautions.

....

13. In the present case, the Board made an endeavour to rely on the exception to the rule of strict liability (Rylands v. Fletcher [(1868) 3 HL 330 : (1861-73) All ER Rep 1]) being “an act of stranger”. The said exception is not available to the Board as the act attributed to the third respondent should reasonably have been anticipated or at any rate its consequences should have been prevented by the appellant-Board. ”

11. For the above reasons, this Court is inclined to direct the respondents to pay ex-gratia amount of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) and Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) to the petitioner for the death of his wife and cow due to electrocution, to which the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Board agreed to and submitted that the same would be paid within a period of four (4) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. If the petitioner intends to claim any compensation over and above the ex-gratia payment/compensation, liberty is granted to him to work out the remedies available to him in the manner known to law.



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

12. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. There shall be no

order as to costs.

19.08.2024

NCC:yes/no
Index:yes/no
Internet:yes/no
Nsr

To:

- 1.The Chairman,
TANGEDCO,
Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 003.
- 2.The District Collector,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 3.The Divisional Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Valliyoor,
Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Superintending Engineer,
TANGEDCO,
Maharaja Nagar,
Tirunelveli – 11.
- 5.The Inspector of Police,
Panagudi Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ, J.

Nsr

W.P.(MD)No.20605 of 2017

19.08.2024