

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5182 of 2016

Ravi Kumar @ Abhinandan Kumar Son of Akhilesh Kumar Sharma, Resident of Mohalla- Mangla-Gauri Temple, P.s.- Civil Line, District- Gaya through his father namely Akhilesh Kumar Sharma S/o Gupteshwar Sharma being minor

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Chairman, Bihar State Electricity Board and Ors
2. The Electrical Inspector, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., Second Floor, Vidyut Bhawan, Bai
3. The D.G.M., South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., near Mirza Ghalib College, Gaya
4. The Executive Engineer, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., Chandauti, Gaya
5. The Chairman, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., 2nd Floor, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna
6. The Managing Director, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., 2nd Floor, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Ro
7. The Board of Director, Bihar State Electricity Board, Vidyut Bhawan, Patna
8. The Board of Director, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., 2nd Floor, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Ro
9. The Board of Director, India Power Corporation Limited, Plot No.- XI-283, Block EP Sector V Sal Lak
10. The E.S.E. cum Nodal Officer, Public Grievance Cell, South Bihar Power Distribution Co. Ltd., 2nd F
11. The Manager, India Power Corporation Ltd. Gandhi Maidan, Near Telephone Exchange, Gaya
12. The Chief Executive Officer CEO, India Power Corporation Ltd., Plot No.- XI-283, Block EP Sector V

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, Mr. Sudhir Kumar Sinha, Advocates.
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Ajay Kumar Gautam, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 19-06-2025 Heard the parties.

2. The petitioner in the present writ application is claiming the following relief(s):-



(i) For issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the respondents authority to make an enquiry and pay adequate compensation to the petitioner who is the minor and filing the writ application for compensation who got injuries due to dropping high tension wire on the body of the petitioner resulting that he suffered grievous injury and caused heavy expense in his treatment due to negligence on the part of the respondents authority who has not taken care to ill-maintain wire resulting that the accident took place.

(ii) For further direction to the Respondents Authority to reexamine the case of the petitioner and pay reasonable compensation in lieu of treatment.

(iii) For further quashing of the letter dated 23.6.2015 memo no. 443 issued under the signature of the D.G.M. South Bihar, Power Distribution Corporation Ltd whereby the respondents authority has taken decision to pay compensation of Rs. 25000/- only and further



direction to the Respondent Authority to re-examine the matter and pass afresh order for payment of compensation.

(iv) And for any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner is found to be entitled in the eye of law.

3. The issue relating to the payment of compensation by a writ Court is no more *res integra* as it has already been well settled by several decisions of this Court earlier that such matter can only be agitated before the competent Civil Courts. One such case is that of ***Rinku Devi v. The State of Bihar & Ors.*** rendered in ***CWJC No. 19247 of 2016*** whereby *vide* judgment/order dated 12.11.2024, it has been clearly held and observed that the matter relating to compensation can only be agitated before the competent Civil Courts.

4. In view of the above settled position, the learned counsel for the petitioner prays for withdrawal of the present writ application with liberty to pursue his remedy before the appropriate Civil Courts. To this prayer being made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for Respondents-State does not have any objection.

5. Considering the nature of prayer being made by



the learned counsel for the petitioner, this writ application is, accordingly, disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to pursue his remedy before the competent Civil Courts.

6. Pending Interlocutory Application, if any, shall also be deemed to have been disposed of.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

perwez

U			
---	--	--	--

