



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

117

CWP-30709-2025

Date of Decision: 30.03.2026

RAJ BAI AND ANR

...Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS.

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Anjali Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG Haryana

Ms. Amisha Rana, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 6

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking directions to respondents to pay compensation on account of death of their family member by electrocution. They are claiming compensation as per respondent's policy dated 08.07.2019.

2. Petitioner No.1 is mother and No.2 is sister of Jai Bhagwan who passed away on 20.10.2024 by electrocution. He was 20 years old. He was sole breadwinner of the family as husband of the petitioner No.1 had already passed away. The petitioner's brother-in-law filed complaint at Police station Sadar, Mahendragarh. On 20.10.2024 the deceased was

taken away to Civil Hospital where a post mortem report confirmed that he has died due to electric shock. The petitioner filed a claim application before respondents seeking compensation but to no avail.

3. Reply filed on behalf of respondents No.2 to 6 is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent while pointing out reply submits that during the pendency of petition a sum of Rs.16,89,150/- has been disbursed to petitioners, thus, the petition has rendered infructuous.

5. In the wake of statement disposed of with liberty to petitioners to move an appropriate application, if payment is not actually received by them.

6. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

March 30, 2026
Deepak DPA

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No