



CWP-31297-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(107) CWP-31297-2025

Date of decision:- 14.11.2025

Sakuntala

...Petitioner

Versus

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Sunil K. Tandon, Advocate (through VC) for the petitioner.

...

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed *inter alia* for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents to pay compensation on account of death of petitioner's son due to electrocution.

2. Mr. Sunil K. Tandon, counsel for the petitioner, states that Sandeep, petitioner's son, was working as a labourer with a contractor of the Electricity Department. On 25.08.2020, when the petitioner's son was repairing 11KV high voltage line, he got entangled with the electricity line and was electrocuted. Counsel states that Sandeep was immediately taken to a Government Hospital, but was declared brought dead. Reference has been made by him that the Death Certificate as well as postmortam report, Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively, to assert that death was due to electric shock. He points out that a FIR No.488, Annexure P-3, was registered on the same day at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh, under Sections 304-A and 34, IPC. Counsel submits that respondents were negligent as they had been informed beforehand, but they failed to switch off the electricity supply. Counsel submits that a policy dated



CWP-31297-2025

-2-

cases of fatal and non-fatal accidents caused due to electrocution, despite submission of various representations, respondents have not taken any action. Counsel submits that petitioner would be satisfied in case a direction be issued to the respondents-authorities to decide the representation dated 10.09.2025, Annexure P-6.

- 3. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.
- 4. Mr. Tushar Kaushik, Advocate, for Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.
- 5. Given the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court does not deem it necessary to call upon the respondents to submit a reply.
- 6. A perusal of the petition shows that the representations, Annexures P-4 to P-6, are pending with the respondents-authorities, but they have not acted upon them even though that they have framed a policy, Annexure P-7, for grant of compensation in such like cases.
- 7. Accordingly, without examining the petition on merits, competent authority is directed to look into the representation, Annexure P-6, and pass appropriate order thereon, in the light of policy, Annexure P-7. The needful be done within a period of four months from the date of communication of a copy of this order.
- 8. In case, competent authority finds that the claim cannot be accepted, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for rejection.
- 9. Writ petition is disposed of.

14.11.2025
Pardeep

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No