



-1-

128

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

**CWP-28554-2025  
Date of decision:-23.09.2025**

Hasina Begam

...Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitaran Nigam Ltd. and anr.

...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, inter alia, for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents to pay compensation of Rs.50 lakhs to the petitioner on account of death of her husband, due to electrocution.

2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that Yasin, petitioner's husband was working as a mason and while doing construction work on 23.09.2020, he came in contact with 11 KV high voltage line and was



-2-

128

electrocuted. Counsel asserts that although petitioner's husband was taken to a hospital, but he expired. Counsel states that the wires were hanging loose and respondents were negligent in maintaining them at a safe distance. He has made a reference to death certificate and postmortem report, Annexures P1 and P2, respectively to assert that the cause of death is due to high voltage electric shock leading to electrocution. Counsel states that a DDR was registered on the same day. Counsel submits that respondents have framed a policy dated 08.07.2019, Annexure P7, which provides for grant of compensation in case of fatal/non-fatal accidents of human beings due to electrocution. Counsel asserts that the petitioner had submitted representations, Annexure P5 and P6 claiming compensation, but they are still pending. Counsel submits that petitioner would be satisfied in case a direction is issued to the competent authority to examine the representation, Annexure P6.

3. Issue notice of motion to the respondents.

4. Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana, 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 response from the respondents.

6. From the averments made in the writ petition, it transpires that representations submitted by petitioner are pending. In view thereof, without examining the claim on merits, writ petition is disposed of with



128

a direction to the competent authority to decide the representation, Annexure P6, within a period of four months from the date of communication of copy of order of this Court.

7. It is clarified that in case the competent authority finds that the claim cannot be accepted, it shall pass a detailed order assigning reasons for its rejection.

**23.09.2025**  
**Brij**

**(SUVIR SEHGAL)**  
**JUDGE**

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