

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

**Civil Revision No.4109 of 2015
Date of Decision: August 18, 2015**

Gian Sagar Educational & Cheritable Trust Petitioner

vs.

Arvind Saini Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Som Nath Saini, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Agnihotri, Advocate for the respondent.

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh J.(Oral)

This is the revision against the order dated 12.05.2015 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Rajpura, vide which in an application filed by the defendant, the plaintiff-petitioner was directed to restore the electricity connection and water supply to the defendant on payment of ½ of the outstanding dues.

The grouse of learned counsel for the petitioner is that in the application, the defendant had stated that he is ready to pay the charges. However, only 1/2 share of the outstanding dues has been deposited without any reason.

A perusal of the file shows that the plaintiff-petitioner has filed a suit for recovery of possession of one Verka Booth, situated within its premises, which is in occupation of the defendant. The

controversy is yet to be decided on merits. It appears that the electricity and water supply connection was disconnected on account of non-payment of the charges.

A further perusal of the file shows that in the application, the defendant had stated that he is ready to pay the electricity charges at the applicable rate of PSPCL, which means that rate of electricity charges levied by plaintiff are disputed. There was no unequivocal undertaking to pay all the charges. The lower court in its wisdom has ordered that $\frac{1}{2}$ share be deposited, which means that for the future, the actual charges claimed from the defendant will have to be deposited as per user.

While exercising the revisional powers, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed.

August 18, 2015
sarita

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE