



CWP-25832-2019

1

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

(224)

CWP-25832-2019

Date of Decision : 21.01.2025

Chotta Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Baljinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahil R. Bakshi, AAG, Punjab
for respondents No.1 to 3, 6 and 7.

Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate
for respondents No.4 and 5.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, a prayer is made for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents-PSPCL to award the compensation to the petitioner, to the tune of Rs.30,00,000/-, along with interest @ 18% per annum from the date of accrual of claim till its realization.

2. On asking for the relief (supra), learned counsel for the petitioner submits that electric tubewell connection was legally installed in the year 2013. From 2013 to 2016, it was running smoothly and the petitioner was paying all the charges. However, it was disconnected in the year 2016, and was restored only in the year 2019.

3. By referring to the observations made by the learned Civil Court concerned, wherethrough, the petitioner has filed a suit for injunction, seeking restoration of connection, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there

is a specific observation that the act of the respondents-PSPCL, is completely



CWP-25832-2019

2

illegal.

4. This Court is not examining the issue pertaining to the act of the respondents-PSPCL. However, this Court is of the view that the asked for prayer, as sought in the instant writ petition cannot be granted, as the same requires production of evidence, where through, the petitioner is required to establish the loss, which he has suffered on account of disconnection, for three years, before the appropriate Court concerned.

5. In view of the above, the petitioner is relegated to the forum/Court concerned, for the relief, as sought in the instant writ petition. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

6. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to file apt motion, before the appropriate forum/Court concerned.

7. In case, the petitioner files any such motion, within a period of two months from today along with the application for condonation of delay, same may be considered sympathetically by the Court concerned, specifically, in view of the fact that the petitioner has opted to file incorrect motion before this Court.

8. **Disposed of** accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

January 21, 2025
Manpreet

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