



CWP-31293-2025

-1-

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

(106)

CWP-31293-2025

Date of decision:- 14.11.2025

Surjeet Kaur**...Petitioner****Versus****Uttar 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 Raju Singh, petitioner's son, was an agriculturist and also doing daily farming. On 27.10.2020, after working in the agricultural field of Mahipal Singh, he came back home, carrying a bundle of grass on his head, which caught entangled with a loose high voltage electricity line and he was electrocuted. Although, he was immediately rushed to Civil Hospital, Gulha, but was declared brought dead. Counsel has made a reference to the post-mortem report, Annexures P-2, to assert that the death of the young man was due to electrocution and complication arising thereafter. He points out that a DDR No.20, Annexure P-3, was registered at Police Station Gulha, District Kaithal, on the same day. Counsel emphasises that respondents were negligent in maintenance of the electricity line. He states that a policy dated 08.07.2019, Annexure P-7, has been framed for payment of compensation, in cases of fatal and non-fatal



accidents caused due to electrocution and 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, Annexure P-6.

3. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.
4. Ms. Dheerja, Advocate, has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of all the three respondents and has filed Vakalatnama, which is taken on record.
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 despite the fact 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