



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(129)

CWP-34444-2025

Date of decision:- 26.11.2025

NACHHATAR SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Ms. Divyanshi Rathore, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner's son, Manpreet Singh, who was 26-years-old, died due to electrocution on 14.10.2024. She submits that the respondents were grossly negligent in failing to maintain and secure live electricity wires. She states that an FIR No.221 dated 14.10.2024, Annexure P-1 has been registered under Section 106 BNS. Reference has also been made by her to the postmortem report, Annexure P-2 to assert that the death is due to electrocution. Counsel states that the respondents have framed a policy dated 18.05.2017 for grant of compensation in case of fatal accidents due to electrocution and the petitioner has applied thereunder. She submits that in response to communication dated 14.10.2024, Annexure P-3 counsel furnished the requisite documents along with a legal notice dated 13.05.2025, Annexure P-4 but financial benefit has not been released.

2. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.



3. On asking of the Court, Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 to 7.
4. Noticing the limited nature of controversy, this Court does not intends to call upon the respondents to furnish a response.
5. It is evident that petitioner’s application for grant of compensation is pending with the respondents for the last more than one year.
6. In view of the above, without examining the claim on merits, competent authority is directed to take a final decision in the matter as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four months from the date of communication of a copy of this order. In case, competent authority finds that petitioner is not entitled to compensation, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for rejection.
7. Writ petition is disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

26.11.2025
parul verma

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