



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CWP-7209-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.03.2026

Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and another ... Petitioners

Versus

National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission & others ... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RAMESH KUMARI**

Present:- Ms. Kavita Joshi, Advocate for the petitioners.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners assail order dated 09.09.2022 passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1) vide which the complaint filed by the complainant has been accepted and the petitioners herein are directed to issue tubewell connection to the complainant as per Chairman Quota within a period of 1 month from receipt of copy of order passed by DCDRC. The petitioners also assail order dated 19.01.2024 passed by State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Punjab (Annexure P-2) and order dated 26.8.2025 passed by National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi (Annexure P-3) vide which the appeal/revision filed by the petitioners have also been dismissed.



2. Respondent No.4 Amolak Singh had filed a complaint under Section 12 of Consumer Protection Act before District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Gurdaspur averring therein that he had applied for a tubewell connection on 18.09.2012 and had deposited requisite amount of Rs.1000/- under the scheme of Chairman's discretionary Quota on priority basis for irrigation of his agricultural land wherein he was given assurance by the petitioners that the same would be released within a month and relying upon such assurance, he had sown paddy in their fields, but since the tubewell connection was not released, the paddy crop was damaged and they had to bear losses.
3. The petitioners (respondents) before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission took a stand that it was the complainant himself who had failed to complete all the formalities and that since a Model Code of Conduct had also come into force on account of announcement of elections on 04.01.2017, therefore, no demand notice had been issued and that it had specifically been decided that the connection would be released only where the applicant had deposited the full cost and the test reports before the imposition of Model Code of Conduct. Further, objections as regards maintainability and as regards limitation were also raised.
4. The District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission after considering the respective stands of the parties and the evidence led before it, observed that while Model Code of Conduct had been imposed on 04.01.2017, the election process had concluded by March, 2017, but despite the same the petitioners had not issued the requisite demand notices and nor had the petitioners shown



anything to hold the complainant disentitled for release of connections. It was thus held that there was deficiency in service on part of the petitioners in releasing the tubewell connection and directions for release of the same were issued vide order dated 09.09.2022 (Annexure P-1) passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Gurdaspur, which was challenged by the petitioners by way of filing appeal before the State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, which also came to be dismissed vide order dated 19.01.2024 (Annexure P-2). Thereafter, the petitioners preferred revision petition before the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, New Delhi, but to no avail and the said revision petition was also dismissed vide common order dated 26.8.2025 (Annexure P-3).

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners while assailing the impugned orders submitted that the order of District Consumer Disputes Commission as well as of State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission and of the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission came to be passed without appreciating the relevant facts and that no right had accrued in favour of the respondent/complainant so as to justify release of connection in his favour and that in any case, the demand notice had not been issued as a Model Code of Conduct had been imposed in the year 2017 and subsequently the complainant never came forward to deposit the complete amount in respect of the tubewell connection.
6. We have considered the aforesaid submissions and have also gone through the aforesaid impugned order.



CWP-7209-2026 (O&M) (4)

7. There is nothing on record to show that after the initial deposit of Rs.1000/- with the application submitted by the complainant, any demand notice was ever raised by the petitioners nor anything was ever conveyed in this regard by the petitioners to the complainant. In any case, consistent findings having been returned in favour of the complainant and the scope of interference in writ petition as against the orders passed in appeal by the Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission or in revision by the National Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission being limited, we do not find any justifiable ground to interfere with the impugned order.
8. There is no merit in the writ petition and the same is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

11.03.2026
Mohan

(RAMESH KUMARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking /reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No