



CWP-3758-2025

1

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

(278)

CWP-3758-2025

Date of Decision : 24.04.2025

Baby Rani

...Petitioner

Versus

PSPCL and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Sunil K. Tandon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deepali Verma, Advocate for
Mr. Naveen S. Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the respondents.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of mandamus, upon the respondents, to pay compensation to the tune of Rs.60,00,000/-, on account of death of one Ajay Kumar, son of the petitioner, who suffered electrocution, while coming into contact with 11000 KV High Transmission Line, specifically, in terms of the law laid down by this Court, in CWP-14046-2012, titled 'Raman versus State of Haryana and others'.

2. This Court has put a specific query to learned counsel for the petitioner, as to whether, in pursuance of the policy adopted by the respondent distribution licensee, the petitioner has approached the Committee concerned, to which, he answered in negative. Though, learned counsel submits that the petitioner has made the representations to various authorities concerned.



CWP-3758-2025

2

3. The instant petition is a misconceived motion, inasmuch as, despite the petitioner being seized of an alternate and efficacious statutory remedy for redressal of his grievance, and without approaching the competent authorities/Committee concerned, as constituted under the apt policy by the distribution licensee concerned, has sidetracked the said remedy, and has straightway accessed this Court, through instituting the instant writ petition.

4. In such circumstances, this Court refrains from exercising its power, as envisaged under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India.

5. However, the petitioner is relegated to the Committee/authorities concerned, as constituted under the apt policy adopted by the respondent distribution licensee, for redressal of his grievance.

6. Consequently, the instant writ petition is **disposed of**.

7. In case, the petitioner approach the competent authority concerned, within a period of 30 days from today, and file such an application, the latter shall make all endeavour to decide the same, within three months thereafter, from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order/judgment, in accordance with law.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

April 24, 2025
Manpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No