



CWP-27772-2025

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(144)

CWP-27772-2025

Date of decision:- 17.09.2025

Phulpati

... Petitioner

Versus

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Sunil K. Tandon, Advocate
for the petitioner (THROUGH V.C.)

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India *inter-alia* for issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus, for grant of compensation on account of death of petitioner's husband-Hukum Singh, due to electrocution.
2. Counsel submits that Hukam Singh, along with a worker, Gurlal Singh, were working in an agricultural field, when Hukam Singh came in contact with low hanging 11 KV voltage electric wire. Counsel states that Hukam Singh was electrocuted and died at the spot. By making a reference to the postmortem report (Annexure P-2), counsel asserts that doctors have opined that the cause of death is cardiac arrest due to electric shock. An FIR No. 303, dated 06.06.2021 (Annexure P-3) was registered under Sections 304-A and 279, IPC, at Police Station Pundri, District Kaithal. Counsel asserts that



CWP-27772-2025

-2-

respondents have framed a policy (Annexure P-7) for grant of compensation in case of fatal/non-fatal accidents of human beings due to electrocution and petitioner has submitted representations (Annexures P-4 to P-6), which are pending before respondents. Counsel submits that petitioner would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the respondents to decide representation (Annexure P-6).

3. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.

4. Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. AG, Haryana has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondents.

5. Given the nature of order proposed to be passed, this Court does not deem it necessary to call upon the respondents to file a response.

6. A perusal of the averments of the writ petition show that representations submitted by the petitioners are pending consideration at the hands of the respondents. In view thereof, without examining the merits of the claim, a command is issued to the competent authority to decide the representation (Annexure P-6) within a period of four months from the date of communication of a copy of this order.

7. It is clarified that in case the competent authority comes to the conclusion that request made in the representation cannot be acceded to, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for rejection.

8. Writ petition is disposed of.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

17.09.2025

pry

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