

2024:PHHC:134308



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

120

CWP-26411-2024

Date of decision: 15.10.2024

RAMBHOOL AND ANOTHER

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

UTTRI HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

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

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

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

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Prayer in the present writ petition is for setting aside the order dated 06.02.2024 passed by the respondents whereby the claim of the petitioner has been rejected.

Counsel for the respondent-distribution licensee refers to the order and contends that all the documents including the PMR as well as the pathology report and the DDR were sent to the doctors for submission of their report as to whether the cause of death could be ascertained or not. The CMO vide memo dated 02.02.2024 held that there was no clear cut cause of death on the basis whereof any conclusivity about the death due to electrocution could be drawn.

Under the given circumstances, the respondents have



rejected the claim by holding that it is not a case of death due to electrocution and that the medical report, PMR and other all reports reflect that there is no such injury mark, entry wound or exit would present on the body of deceased on the basis whereof the cause of death be attributed due to electrocution. He contends that any dispute raised by the petitioner about the finding recorded by the doctors would give rise to disputed questions of fact which cannot be gone into by a writ Court.

Faced with the above, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner does not press the instant writ petition at this stage with liberty to take recourse to appropriate remedy in accordance with law.

The present writ petition is disposed of as not pressed accordingly.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

OCTOBER 15, 2024
Vishal sharma

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