

2024:PHHC:167243



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

221**CWP-3424-2023 (O&M)****Date of decision: 13.12.2024**

Mamu Ram

...Petitioner

VERSUS

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others

...Respondents

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

Present :- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Vivek Saini, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2-DHBVNL

Mr. Sandeep Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.3.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has approached this Court for directing the respondents to pay the compensation to the tune of Rs.50 lacs on account of death of his son-Rajesh Kumar (since deceased) due to electrocution from 11 KV electric line.

During the course of hearing, the matter was taken up for hearing on 04.09.2023 when the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Distribution Licensee informed that compensation to the tune of Rs.15,12,450/- already stands released in favor of respondent No.3-Smt. `Reena widow of deceased-Rajesh Kumar being class-I legal heir and that the petitioner being class-II legal heir does not have any preferential right to claim compensation. Hence, it was not a case of non-payment of compensation but was instead a case where there is a dispute *inter se*

2024:PHHC:167243



221

CWP-3424-2023 (O&M)

-2-

amongst the legal heirs with respect to the compensation. The matter was thereafter, adjourned to 28.09.2023 when the parties chose not to appear. In the interest of justice, the matter was adjourned to 04.10.2023 but a written request for an adjournment was circulated on behalf of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner on the ground that the arguing counsel was not well. The matter was thus adjourned to 06.12.2013, when there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner once again. The hearing was thus deferred to 09.02.2024, when learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner chose not to appear in the proceedings. The hearing was adjourned to 26.04.2024 in the interest of justice when learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner sought time to advance arguments. The matter was adjourned to 23.08.2024 but a written request on behalf of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner again circulated on the ground that the arguing counsel is not well. The matter was adjourned for today, however, there is no representation on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner. It seems that the petitioner is no more interested in pursuing the present petition.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

13.12.2024

Mangal Singh

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