



CGHC010368112022



2026:CGHC:30397

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 4865 of 2022

Purnima Bai Verma W/o Late Guddu Verma Aged About 35 Years R/o Village - Amilidih Kala, Tehsil - Khairagarh, Police Station - Chhuikhadan, District - Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

- 1** - State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Secretary, Urban Administration Development Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 2** - Executive Director, Chhattisgarh, State Power Distribution Company Limited, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh
- 3** - Collector, Rajandgaon, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh
- 4** - Executive Director, Rajnandgaon Division, Chhattisgarh, State Power Distribution Company Limited, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh
- 5** - The Executive Engineer, CSPDCL, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnangaon Chhattisgarh
- 6** - Executive Engineer, CSPDCL, Division Khairagarh District - Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	: Mr. Pramod Ramteke, Advocate
For State	: Mr. Shreyansh Mehta, Panel Lawyer
For CSPDCL	: Mr. Mayank Chandrakar, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Amitendra Kishore Prasad, Judge
Order on Board

17.07.2026

1. By filing the present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for following relief(s) :-

“10.1 That, this Hon'ble Court may kindly pleased to direct the respondent authorities to consider the claim of the petitioner, which is claiming compensation amount, regarding death of the son of the petitioner who died due to electrocution.

10.2 Any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem and proper in the present circumstances of the case.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has assailed the order dated 02.09.2022 (Annexure P/1) passed by the Executive Engineer, Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited, Khairagarh Division, whereby the petitioner's claim for grant of compensation on account of the death of her husband due to electrocution has been rejected. It is submitted that the petitioner's husband, late Shri Guddu Verma, died on 27.10.2019 due to electrocution, as is evident from the post-mortem report, and the incident was duly reported to the concerned Police Station. Learned counsel would contend that the respondent-CSPDCL has itself framed a policy/circular dated

10.09.2018, under which a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- is payable as compensation to the legal heirs of a person who dies due to electrocution.

3. It is further submitted that despite submitting representations before the competent authorities and even after this Court, in W.P. (C) No.5081/2021, directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's claim, the respondent authority has illegally rejected the same by observing that no provision exists for grant of compensation. According to learned counsel, such a finding is ex facie contrary to the Circular dated 10.09.2018, which specifically provides for payment of compensation in cases of death due to electrocution. It is, therefore, argued that the impugned order deserves to be quashed and the respondents be directed to release compensation in favour of the petitioner in accordance with the aforesaid Circular.
4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondents supports the impugned order and submits that the petitioner's claim has rightly been rejected in accordance with the policy governing payment of ex gratia compensation. It is contended that though the death of the petitioner's husband was on account of electrocution, the unfortunate incident occurred within the residential premises of the petitioner and not on account of any defect in the electricity distribution system falling within the responsibility of the Distribution Company. Learned counsel

submits that under the Circular dated 10.09.2018, compensation is admissible only in cases where the electrical accident occurs in relation to the distribution system maintained by the Distribution Company, namely from the electric pole up to the electricity meter or metering point, and not for accidents occurring within the consumer's internal wiring or electrical installations situated inside the premises. Since the accident in the present case admittedly occurred inside the petitioner's house, the petitioner is not entitled to claim compensation under the said Circular. It is, therefore, prayed that the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties at length and perused the material available on record.
6. Upon due consideration of the rival submissions and the documents placed on record, this Court finds that the death of the petitioner's husband is undoubtedly a tragic incident. However, the entitlement to compensation has to be examined strictly in accordance with the policy governing such claims. A perusal of the Circular dated 10.09.2018 clearly indicates that the ex gratia compensation contemplated therein is payable only in cases where the electrical accident is attributable to the electricity distribution system maintained by the Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Limited, i.e., the electrical network extending from the distribution pole up to the consumer's meter/metering point.

7. In the present case, the material available on record does not indicate that the accident occurred within the aforesaid area of responsibility of the Distribution Company. On the contrary, it is evident that the incident occurred inside the residential house of the petitioner, after the metering point, within the consumer's own internal electrical installation. Once the accident has occurred within the domestic premises and beyond the electricity meter, the same falls outside the scope and ambit of the Circular dated 10.09.2018. Consequently, the petitioner cannot claim the benefit of the compensation scheme merely because the death was caused by electrocution.
8. This Court is, therefore, of the considered opinion that the competent authority has committed no jurisdictional error or legal infirmity in rejecting the petitioner's claim for compensation. The impugned order does not warrant interference in exercise of the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
9. Accordingly, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is dismissed. It is further observed that since the electrical accident admittedly occurred within the residential premises of the petitioner and not within the distribution system extending from the electric pole up to the electricity meter, the compensation contemplated under the Circular dated 10.09.2018, as prayed for by the petitioner, cannot be granted.

- 10.** Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge

Yogesh