



117

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

**RSA-453-2023(O&M)
XOBS-7-2023(O&M)
Date of Decision : 12.11.2025**

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM & ANR Appellants

VERSUS

KAMAL SINGH Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Madhur Singh, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Prashant Sethi, Advocate for the respondent/cross-objector.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The defendant-appellants are in regular second appeal challenging the judgment and decree passed by the First Appellate Court whereby their appeal was dismissed, and the judgment and decree passed by the Trial Court in favour of the plaintiff-respondent was affirmed.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the defendant-appellants has submitted that the question of law involved in the present appeal as to whether jurisdiction of the Civil Court is barred in view of Section 145 of the Electricity Act, 2003, has since been decided by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **RSA-4181-2016 [Mahesh Kumar Versus Sub Divisional Officer & Anr.]** vide judgment dated 14.05.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff-respondent/cross-objector does not dispute this factual position.

4. In view thereof the present appeal is allowed and the suit filed by the plaintiff-respondent stands dismissed on the ground of jurisdiction. However, the plaintiff-respondent would have the liberty to avail the remedies as available in law.

5. It is made clear that any evidence recorded/observations made in the impugned judgments and decrees would not operate as *res judicata* in any subsequent proceedings initiated by the plaintiff-respondent. Cross objections being XOBJS-7-2023 as well as pending applications, if any, also stands disposed off.

12.11.2025
Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No