



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

107

CR-4656-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06.11.2025

Harminder Singh

...Petitioner

V/s

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitram Nigam Ltd. and another

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Gaur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Kewal Krishan, Advocate for

Mr.S.K. Mahajan, Advocate, for the respondents.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The challenge in the instant revision petition, preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, is to the order dated 08.01.2018 (Annexure P-3) passed by the Court of District Judge, Panchkula, vide which the application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, as also the appeal, were dismissed.

2. On the aforesaid issue, this Court has recently pronounced a judgment dated 14.10.2025 in CR-1901-2025 (*Sunil Kumar Dahiya vs. Suresh Kochhar*), vide which it has been held that where an application seeking condonation of delay in filing the appeal and, consequently, the appeal itself are dismissed, the only remedy available would be to file an appeal against the said decision, and that the revision petition would not be maintainable.

3. In view of the aforesaid, the present revision petition is disposed of in terms of the observations made in the judgment rendered in **Sunil Kumar Dahiya's** case (supra).



4. Needless to assert, as held in the judgment referred to above, the petitioner shall be at liberty to file a regular second appeal, if so advised, in accordance with law.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

November 06, 2025
vcgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No