



CR No.7703 of 2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

154

CR No.7703 of 2025

Date of decision: November 18th, 2025

Vijay Kumar Shukla

...Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioner

Ms. Nikita Goel, Advocate
for the respondents.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 31.10.2025, this Court was pleased to pass the following
order:

*Present:- Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate for the
petitioner.*

Inter alia contends that in the present case, the electric connection in question was earlier in the name of mother of the petitioner and was subsequently inherited by the petitioner after the death of Sharda Rani. It is submitted that the said connection is the sole connection by virtue of which the electricity is supplied to the premises of Param Dham Nau Gaj Peer Baba', Ambala Cantt and the same has been continuing for the last more than thirty years. It is further submitted that against the judgment and decree dated 01.09.2025, the petitioner had filed an appeal under Section 96 of CPC along with application for stay and in the said case, although, notice was issued and the case is now fixed for arguments on 14.01.2026 but the interim prayer made by



the petitioner for restraining the respondents from disconnecting the electricity connection issued in the name of the appellant (petitioner herein) has been dismissed. It is submitted that in case, the electricity connection is disconnected during the pendency of the appeal then appeal filed by the petitioner would be rendered infructuous and the petitioner would suffer irreparable loss. It is submitted that the petitioner has paid charges upto September, 2025 and would continue to pay the electricity charges in accordance with law. It is further submitted that the petitioner is also ready to argue the main appeal itself on the day the First Appellate Court directs the petitioner to argue the matter.

Notice of motion for 18.11.2025.

To be shown in the urgent list.

Till the next date of hearing, status quo with respect to electricity connection bearing Account No.A12KW012184 shall be maintained.

Liberty is granted to the petitioner to serve the respondents through their counsel before the trial Court.

The petitioner would continue to pay the electricity charges to the respondents-Department.

31.10.2025”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has reiterated the abovesaid arguments and has submitted that at least till the time the main appeal is not decided, the interim order granted in favour of the petitioner be continued.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents, on the other hand, has submitted that in case the interim order is to continue during the pendency of the first appeal, then the petitioner be directed to argue the main appeal itself and also further be directed to continue to pay the electricity charges to the respondents. It is further submitted that the grant and continuation of the



CR No.7703 of 2025

3

interim order should not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the First Appellate Court be directed to decide the case independently, after hearing both the sides.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has no objection to the said course of action.

5. Keeping in view the abovesaid facts and circumstances and the fair stand taken by learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents, the present revision petition is partly allowed with the following observations/directions:

- (i) Till the time the first appeal is decided by the First Appellate Court, the interim order dated 31.10.2025 would continue. The same would be subject to the petitioner continuing to pay the electricity charges to the respondents-Department.
- (ii) The petitioner, as undertaken before this Court, would be ready to argue the matter whenever directed by the First Appellate Court to argue the same. The First Appellate Court is requested to decide the appeal as expeditiously as possible and even the counsel for the respondents would fully assist the First Appellate Court in expeditious disposal of the case.
- (iii) The grant of interim order dated 31.10.2025 and the continuation of the same should not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and the First Appellate Court would decide the case independently, after hearing both the parties.

November 18th, 2025
Puneet

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No