



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 03.12.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.13483 of 2018

and

W.M.P(MD)No.12291 of 2018

V.Saravanan

...Petitioner

Vs

1. The Chairman,
Tamilnadu Generation and Distribution Corporation,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 02.

2. The Superintending Engineer,
Tamilnadu Generation and Distribution Corporation,
K.Pudur, Madurai - 625 007,
Madurai District.

...Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records pursuant to the impugned order of the 2nd respondent in Ka.N.Me.Po/Ma Me PaVa/Madu/NeA/NeB2/NeU.3/Ko.Va 2017 dated 27/12/2017 and quash the same and consequently directing the respondents to pay a sum of Rs.10 lakhs towards compensation for the death of my wife namely Chithra Devi due to the Electrocution.

For Petitioner : M/s.S.M.Mohan Gandhi

For Respondents : Mr.S.Deenadhayalan
Standing Counsel



WEB COPY



ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed seeking to quash the order passed by the second respondent herein on 27.12.2017 wherein the request of the petitioner for grant of compensation to the death of his wife has been rejected.

2. A perusal of the records reveal that the petitioner's wife and one Manimegalai have gone to take bath in periyar 9th channel on 30.09.2011 at about 4.00 p.m.

3. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, electricity passed through the stay wire into the water and both of them got electrocuted. The wife of the petitioner had died after being admitted in the hospital.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further submits that an FIR was registered in Cr.No.473 of 2011 on the file of the Othakadai Police Station under Section 174 of Cr.P.C. wherein it reveals that the death has happened due to electrocution. Seeking compensation, the petitioner has approached the respondents. Under the impugned order dated 27.12.2017, the



respondents have rejected the request of the petitioner on the ground that the postmortem report does not disclose the cause of death as electrocution.

Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

5. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, an FIR was lodged by the Village Administrative Officer clearly discloses that the death has happened only due to electrocution. He also relied upon the inquest report wherein it reflected as electrocution. However, the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondents relies upon the postmortem report wherein it is stated that the death has occurred due to Cranio Cerebral injuries. Therefore, according to the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondents, the death is not attributable to the electrocution.

6. I have carefully considered the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. The narration of the facts would clearly indicate that the respondents have raised serious dispute with regard to cause of the death the petitioner's wife especially in the light of the postmortem report. In such circumstances, it would not be advisable for this Court to entertain the writ petition for granting



compensation. The petitioner is directed to approach the competent civil Court seeking compensation. Preserving the said rights of the writ petitioner, this writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected writ miscellaneous petition is also closed.

03.12.2025

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
RJR



- <https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

RJR

W.P.(MD)No.13483 of 2018

03.12.2025