

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

**CR-2209-2023**  
**Date of Decision : 20.09.2023**

Hari Chand @ Har Chand

..... Petitioner

Versus

Balram and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

\*\*\*

Present : Ms. Sonia G.Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, Advocate  
for respondents No.1 and 2.

\*\*\*

**VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)**

As per the report received from the Mediation & Conciliation Centre of this Court, the parties could not arrive at an amicable settlement.

1. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the order dated 28.02.2023, passed by the Civil Judge (Junior Division), Karnal (Annexure P-6), vide which the application moved by the respondents for restoration of the electricity supply or for issuance of a 'No Objection Certificate' for the sanction of a new electricity connection was allowed.

2. A civil suit (Annexure P-1) was filed by respondents No.1

and 2-plaintiffs against the present petitioner-defendant No.1 and proforma respondents-defendants No.2 to 4 for permanent injunction restraining them from interfering or dispossessing them from a portion of the house situated in Village Pingli, Tehsil & District Karnal (fully described in the plaint). Respondents No.1 and 2-plaintiffs are the son and daughter-in-law of the petitioner-defendant No.1 whereas proforma respondents-defendants are the brothers and sister-in-law (Bhabhi) of respondent No.1 Balram. Alongwith the suit, an application for the grant of ad-interim injunction was filed.

2(ii) The suit was resisted by the defendants. In the written statement, a stand was taken that respondents No.1 and 2-plaintiffs had been harassing the present petitioner and had been humiliating him with an intention to grab his property.

2(iii) Vide order dated 08.11.2021, the defendants in the suit were restrained from causing interference in the peaceful possession of the plaintiffs over the portion shown in green colour in the site plan attached with plaint, till the disposal of the suit.

2(iv) Since there was an issue with regard to electricity, an application (Annexure P-4) was filed by respondents No.1 and 2-plaintiffs seeking a direction to the defendants either to restore the electricity supply in the portion in their possession or to give a 'No Objection Certificate' for the sanction of a new Electricity connection. This application was also opposed.

2(v) Vide impugned order dated 28.02.2023, the said

application was allowed wherein it was held that respondents No.1 and 2 were entitled to get a separate temporary electricity connection from the Electricity Department in the green portion shown in the site plan, till the decision of the suit. It is against this order that the present revision petition has been preferred.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner, being the father of respondent No.1, is being harassed by his own son. It has also been submitted that the order passed by the trial Court is not sustainable since respondents No.1 and 2 are not paying the electricity bill.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondents No.1 and 2 has submitted that the impugned order does not call for any interference since the only direction that has been issued is to allot a separate temporary electricity connection during the pendency of the suit.

6. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and find no illegality in the impugned order.

7. No doubt, parties are closely related, the petitioner being the father of respondent No.1. However, sadly enough, the parties are involved in a bitter litigation. Efforts to resolve the matter by way of mediation also failed. In so far as the impugned order is concerned, the only direction is of allotment of a separate temporary electricity connection to respondents No.1 and 2 till the decision of

the suit. I do not find any illegality in the said order as respondents No.1 and 2 would also have equal rights to enjoy the basic necessities of the life. In any case, the said direction shall enure only during the pendency of the suit and it would be needless to mention here that such release of electricity connection to respondents would not confer any right upon them entitling them to claim any right only in view of the release of electricity connection in their favour.

The petition is accordingly disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)  
JUDGE

20.09.2023  
mamta

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | Yes/No |