



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

203

CWP-3919-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 02.05.2025

Amrik Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Rohit Kapoor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. H.S. Ghuman, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(oral)

1. Through the instant petition prayer is made for issuance of certiorari for quashing of the order passed by the Superintending Engineer (Commercial), Punjab State Power Corporation Limited, Jalandhar-respondent No.3, whereby, the electric connection for tubewell of the petitioner was ordered to be released from AP Feeder.

2. The grievance which propelled the present petitioner to file the instant petition is that the petitioner made a request for grant of tubewell connection from Badon Kandi Feeder, which has been rejected arbitrarily, without assigning any reason, whereas, number of other persons, of that area have already been granted connection from the Kandi Feeder (24 hours). He further submits that the transmission lines which connects Kandi Feeder are near to the land of the petitioner, whereas, the transmission line of AP



Feeder are at a farther distance.

3. Mr. H.S. Ghuman, learned counsel for the respondent-Distribution Licensee, after having instructions from the quarter concerned, submits that though the petitioner does not have any pre-existing right to ask for connection from a particular Feeder, as it was a purely technical decision taken by the authorities concerned, and only after considering all the technical aspects, the said decision has been taken. He also submits that there is no discrimination in the said decision, as the same is based on certain parameters, and the Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has failed to point out any error in the administrative decision taken by the authorities concerned. Finally, after having instruction from the quarter concerned, he submits that, in case, the instant case is not considered as a precedent, and since the matter is pending since the year 2016, the respondent- Distribution Licensee, submits that they shall reconsider the request of the petitioner, for providing tubewell connection through Kandi Feeder.

4. In view of the specific stand taken by the respondents, this Court is disposing of the instant petition with a direction upon the respondent – Distribution Licensee concerned, to reconsider the entire issue within 15 days from today. It goes without saying that this Court has not passed the order on merits of the instant case, and therefore, it cannot be considered as a precedent to any other person.

5. **Disposed of**, accordingly.

02.05.2025

Satyawan

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No