



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

\*\*\*\*

**CWP-22440-2013**

**Date of Decision: 09.09.2025**

Darbara Singh and Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present:- Mr. Amarjit Singh Virk, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Kumar Khubbar, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Arvind Seth, Advocate and  
Mr. Shubham Sharma, Advocate  
for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*\*

**JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)**

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondents to pay them compensation on account of death of their son.

2. The petitioners are parents of Inderjeet Singh who joined Haryana Police Force on 02.04.2012 as Constable. He was under training and posted at main gate of Police Lines, Recruitment Training Centre, Jind. He died on 16.09.2012 due to electrocution. There was barbed wire tied around the electric pole. The said barbed wire was used to protect the premises from stray animals. The Cow entered in the premises and petitioner was electrocuted while pushing the cow out of park. He died on the spot due to electric shock.

3. Learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that Inderjeet Singh was only son of the petitioners. He died due to negligence on the part of Authorities. The barbed wire was tied around an electric pole. Due to rain, current started flowing in the wire and petitioners' son died due to electrocution.

4. Learned counsel representing respondent No.4 submits that there was no lapse on the part of respondent No.4-Nigam. There were complaints from other employees to the effect that wire should not be tied around electric pole because it may create electric current.

5. Learned State counsel submits that petitioners have been paid Rs.1,30,000/- under different headings and they are eligible for last drawn salary for 15 years as per policy of the State, thus, petitioners stand duly compensated. There was lapse, if any, on the part of the Electricity Department.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record with their able assistance.

7. From the perusal of record, it is evident that respondents are not disputing that there was a barbed wire tied around electric pole. The said wire was tied around electric pole just to create fencing around the park. It is not disputed that petitioner had died due to electrocution and he was on duty at the time of alleged incident. The respondents are trying to shift burden upon each other. They are not disputing the alleged incident that took place and petitioners lost their only son. He was just 27 years old and had joined service 05 months back. The respondents are liable to pay compensation because financial assistance which they had extended to petitioners is extended to every employee who dies while in service.

Case of petitioners is different from normal casualty. It is a case of death while on duty and that too on account of lapse on the part of respondents.

The petitioners are entitled to compensation.

8. Considering the age of the deceased and his post, this Court finds it appropriate to direct respondents No.1 to 3 to pay a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- as compensation to petitioners within two months from today failing which respondents shall be liable to pay interest @ 9% on the expiry of said period.

9. ***Disposed of.***

**(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**09.09.2025**

*Prince Chawla*

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