



257

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

RSA-1329-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 19.09.2025

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LTD. ... Appellant

Versus

VIJAY ARYA ... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. B.R. Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. S.K. Mahajan, Advocate for the appellant.

None for the respondent despite service.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The defendant-appellant is in present Regular Second Appeal, challenging the judgment and decree passed by the First Appellate Court whereby its 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 senior counsel appearing on behalf of the defendant-appellant 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**, titled as '**Mahesh Kumar Versus Sub Divisional Officer and Another**' vide judgment dated 14.05.2025.

3. As per the Office report, the respondent stands duly served. However, none has put in appearance on his behalf despite service.

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. Pending applications, if any, also stands disposed off.

19.09.2025
Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO