



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP-23794-2024(O&M)
Date of decision: 25.11.2024

Jaspal Kaur Romana and others ... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

**CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present: Dr. Rau P.S. Girwar, Advocate,
Mr. K.T. Rau, Advocate,
Mr. A.A.P. Rau, Advocate, and
Ms. Babita Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Vipal Pal Yadav, Addl. AG, Punjab.
Ms. Shivani Sharma, Advocate, for respondents No.3 & 7.
Mr. M.S. Longia, Advocate, for the respondent(s)-PSPCL.
...

ARUN PALLI, J. (Oral)

On October 15, 2024, this Court had passed the following order:

“With reference to our order dated 18.09.2024, the written statement on behalf of respondent No.3 and 7, filed in Court today, is taken on record. Copy furnished.

However, learned counsel for the respondent-PSPCL submits that the Corporation is ready/willing to contribute 50% of the total amount, that works out to Rs.122.46 lakh, to discharge its obligation.

Faced with this, learned counsel for respondent No.3 and 7 prays for a short accommodation to seek instructions and respond.

Adjourned to 06.11.2024.”

Whereafter, on the adjourned date, the following order was passed:

“With reference to our order dated October 15, 2024, learned Senior counsel for the Bathinda



Development Authority submits that the requisite amount has since been sought from the Punjab Urban Planning & Development Authority, so as to remit the same with the respondent-Corporation, to facilitate the process of execution of the project. Accordingly, a short accommodation is prayed for.

Adjourned to 25.11.2024.”

With reference to the orders referred to above, an affidavit of Estate Officer, Bathinda Development Authority, Bathinda, dated 22.11.2024, on behalf of respondents No.3 & 7, has been filed in the Court today, which is taken on record. And, the averments set out in paragraphs 4 & 5 read as thus:

“4. That, as per the aforementioned letter, the total expenditure for the said work amounts to Rs.250.74 lakh, of which 50% comes to Rs.125.37 lakh.

5. That upon receipt of the said letter, the deponent’s office promptly transferred an amount of Rs.125.37 lakh (Cheque No. 000820 dated 20.11.2024) via RTGS to the account of PSPCL. The responsibility for further necessary action now lies with PSPCL.”

Accordingly, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that as respondents No.3 & 7 have also remitted the requisite amount, i.e. Rs.125.37 lakh, in the account of the respondent-Corporation, the subject work has since been commissioned.

Likewise, Mr. M.S. Longia, learned counsel for the respondent(s)-Corporation, on instructions from Sandeep Kumar Garg, Addl. SE, D.S. Division, PSPCL, Bathinda, submits that, at best, the authority would take 25 days to complete the work as regards electrical infrastructure, and release the connection in favour of the petitioners. Therefore, he submits that nothing substantive survives in the petition and the same be disposed of accordingly.

That being so, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that let the petition be disposed of in terms of the statement of learned counsel for the respondent(s).



In the wake of the position sketched out above, and in terms of the statements made by learned counsel for the parties, the petition is accordingly disposed of.

(Arun Palli)
Judge

(Vikram Aggarwal)
Judge

25.11.2024
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES/NO
Whether Reportable:	YES/NO