

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants contends that from the photograph, which was brought before the learned Single Judge, a wire was seen hanging on the enclosure belonging to the respondent No.3.

3. On being asked as to how, it is proved that respondent Nos.1 and 2 were negligent, learned counsel for the appellants has not been able to show as to whether, such wire was hanging due to the negligence of respondent Nos.1 and 2 or respondent No.3 and/or was cause of the accident.

4. Once, in order to ascertain the negligence of a particular authority, evidence is needed to be brought on record and also to be appreciated hence, the view taken by the learned Single Judge vide order dated 12.08.2025 that the writ petition is not the appropriate remedy in the facts and circumstances of the present case, cannot be faulted with.

5. Further, in the absence of any cogent ground to show that the order dated 12.08.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, is perverse either on facts or in law, no ground is made out for any interference by this Court.

6. Accordingly, the present appeal stands dismissed.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE**

06-04-2026
Sapna Goyal

**(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE**

NOTE: Whether speaking/ reasoned: YES
Whether reportable: NO