



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(122)

CWP-38711-2025

Date of decision:- 29.01.2026

SHISHAN SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Rahul Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana
for respondents No.2 to 5 -UHBVNL.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Counsel for the petitioner states that petitioner's 21-year-old son, Naveen Kumar, unfortunately died due to electrocution on 28.08.2025. He states that petitioner's son was working as a labourer and an iron rod, carried by him, came in contact with a loose electricity wire, resulting in an electric shock and eventual death. Counsel submits that the Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (UHBVNL) was negligent in maintaining the electricity lines and is responsible for the unfortunate demise. Counsel has made a reference to DDR as well as the postmortem report, Annexures P-1 and P-2, to assert that death is due to electrocution. Counsel submits that a policy has been framed by



UHBVNL for grant of compensation in cases of fatal accidents due to electrocution and a representation, Annexure P-4, as well as legal notice, Annexure P-5, have been served upon the respondents, but petitioner has not been granted any financial assistance.

2. Advance copy of the petition has been served upon the respondents.
3. Mr. Deepak Vashisht, DAG, Haryana, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.2 to 5. Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate, states that a policy dated 08.07.2019, has been framed by Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited (UHBVNL), whereby it has been decided to grant compensation in such like cases. On specific instructions, he states that representation/legal notice given by the petitioner shall be decided within a period of two months.
4. In view of the statement made by Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate, writ petition is disposed of.
5. It is clarified that in case, the competent authority finds that claim raised by the petitioner cannot be acceded to, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for rejection.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

29.01.2026

parul verma

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