



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

(115-2)

CWP-34260-2025

Date of decision:- 23.12.2025

MUNNI DEVI

... Petitioner

Versus

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LIMITED AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Sunil Kumar Tandon, Advocate
for the petitioner
(through video conferencing).

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Mr. Sunil Kumar Tandon, counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's son namely Sudama who was working as a driver and his cousin Jitendra Kumar, were transporting goods when they came in contact with a loosely hanging 11 KV power line on 20.10.2021. They suffered an electric shock and were immediately rushed to a hospital, where they were declared as brought dead. Reference has been made by the counsel to postmortem report dated 21.10.2021, Annexure P-1, as well as DDR, Annexure P-2, to assert that death is due to electrocution. Counsel submits that the electricity lines were not properly maintained by Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (UHBVNL) and its officials are responsible for the accident. He states that UHBVNL is liable to compensate the petitioner for the unfortunate demise of her son. He states that a policy dated 08.07.2019, Annexure P-6, has been framed by UHBVNL for grant of compensation and petitioner has submitted a representation dated 30.09.2025, Annexure P-5, for release of financial assistance but it has not been dealt with.



2. Advance copy of the petition has been served upon the respondents.
3. Mr. Tushar Kaushik, Advocate for Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents and has filed Vakalatnama, which is taken on record. He does not have any instructions regarding the representation.
4. Given the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court does not deem it necessary to call for a response from the respondents.
5. Perusal of the petition shows that representation, Annexure P-5, is pending with the respondents and has not been decided. In view thereof, without examining the claim on merits, writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to decide the representation, Annexure P-5, within a period of four months from the date of communication of a copy of this order.
6. Needless to mention, in case, the competent authority finds that claim cannot be accepted, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for rejection.
7. Writ petition is disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

23.12.2025
parul verma

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