

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1613 of 2015

Date of Decision.10.03.2015

Seema Mehra

.....Petitioner

Versus

Vinod Thapar and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Rahul Rampal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not ?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. I will make no intervention with an order passed by the trial Court which is appropriate and just in that it has allowed for a tenant to have the new electricity connection taken and indemnity taken from the party at the time when a new electricity connection is given. Electricity connection is no longer a luxury and in the scheme of Electricity Act, it is a necessity.

2. The revision petition is a needless luxury and there is nothing to be clarified in the order which I had passed already where I had made it known that the tenant's impleadment in the suit was appropriate and just where the issue was asking for a relief of injunction only against the Electricity Board without making the tenant a party. I had attempted to make the scales even for the landlord who was contending that he was forced to pay electricity charges which was payable by the tenant and hence, I had directed that the charges paid

by the landlord shall be refunded to the landlord by the tenant. It appears that the landlord was successful in securing an injunction subsequently and when the electricity connection was sought at the instance of the tenant, the court has every justification to vacate it and also directed a fresh connection with indemnity taken by him.

3. The revision petition is vexatious and it is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

March 10, 2015
Pankaj*