



CWP-9857-2018

1

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

(209)

CWP-9857-2018

Date of Decision : 07.01.2025

Surinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

PSPCL and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Kuldeep V. Singh Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, cast under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, challenge is thrown to the assessment order dated 03.03.2018 (Annexure P-10), wherethrough, an assessment order has been issued under Section 135 of The Electricity Act, 2003 (hereinafter to be referred to as 'the Act of 2003').

2. Perusal of the instant petition, unfolds that the petitioner has already deposited the assessed amount, under protest, and the natural consequence was that no FIR was registered against the present petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is not disputing factum of the theft, as his sole grievance is with regard to the amount assessed under Section 135 of the Act of 2003.



CWP-9857-2018

4. The grievance, which the petitioner has raised, through the instant petition, regarding the assessment order, in fact, can be challenged before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF), and instead of approaching the authorities concerned, the instant petition has been filed, which is a misconceived motion.
5. Accordingly, the petitioner is relegated to the authorities concerned, for the relief, as asked through the instant petition, if the grievance still survives.
6. In case, the petitioner prefers a petition before the authorities concerned, within a period of 15 days from today, the application for condonation of delay may be considered most sympathetically.
7. **Disposed of** in the above terms.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

January 07, 2025
Manpreet

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