



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

**CR-2326-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 06.05.2025**

Karam Singh

...Petitioner

Vs.

Uttar Haryana Bijli Nigam Limited, Kaithal ...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. Dhananjay Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Baldev Raj Mahajan, Senior Advocate
with Sh. Arvind Seth, AAG, Haryana.
Ms. Nikita Goel, Advocate
Ms. Harshita Dhanda, Advocate and
Mr. Shubham Sharma, Advocate
for the respondent.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner herein has filed a suit for mandatory and permanent injunction directing the respondents to restore electricity connection of his tubewell alongwith an application for grant of temporary mandatory injunction, which was allowed by the trial Court but was set aside by the First Appellate Court. While filing the suit on 05.07.2022, he claims that his electricity connection was disconnected on 17.02.2022 without issuance of mandatory notice of 15 days. On the other hand, the Electricity Supply Company claimed that the electricity connection was discontinued in the year 2016-17 for non-payment of dues. In the year 2019, the plaintiff did deposit Rs.13,380/- under a scheme, however, his connection was never restored. He also has not paid any



amount after 26.11.2019.

2. The trial Court granted temporary mandatory injunction, which as already noticed is reversed by the Appellate Court.

3. Heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paper-book.

4. Learned counsel representing the petitioner submits that the electricity connection remained active till February, 2022 and the petitioner would have deposited the amount if there was demand for the same. He submits that he was being issued bill reflecting that no payment is due.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel representing the respondent submits that the electricity connection was dis-connected in the year 2016-17 and the amount deposited by the petitioner in the year 2019 did not result in restoration of electricity connection. It is submitted that by way of interim order, the plaintiff's suit could not be decreed.

6. This Court has considered the submissions made by the learned counsel representing the parties.

7. The order directing interim mandatory injunction is required to be passed in rare and exceptional circumstances where the plaintiff proves a strong *prima facie* case. In this case, the petitioner has failed to show that the electricity connection was ever restored in the year 2019 and was thereafter, dis-connected on 17.02.2022. The suit was filed on 05.07.2022. It is not appropriate to assume continuation of electric connection only because there was some invoices issued to the petitioner reflecting that the payment is not due. Moreover, the suit filed by the petitioner is pending.

8. Keeping in view the facts of the case, the trial Court is directed to make sincere endeavors for expeditious disposal of the same, preferably within a period of one year.
9. The revision petition is disposed of.
10. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

06.05.2025	(ANIL KSHETARPAL)	
neeraj	JUDGE	
Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No