



\$~68

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CM(M) 190/2025**

SUMAN RANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mohit Kumar, Advocate.

versus

YATIN ARORA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Abhijit Mishra, Ms. Payal Bahl,
Mr. Saurav Singh, Mr. Vikhyat Gupta
and Mr. Himanshu Tomar,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

%

30.01.2025

CM APPL. 5858/2025 (exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

This application stands disposed of.

CM(M) 190/2025 & CM APPL. 5857/2025 (stay)

1. This is a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India praying for setting aside the order dated 24.01.2025 in Civil Suit (Comm) No. 32/2025, titled as, “Yatin Arora vs Union of India & Ors.”, passed by the Court of learned District Judge, whereby the Court issued directions to the petitioner (defendant Nos. 6 and 7) to get the electricity connection restored within a period of five days.

2. The factual background is that the respondent filed a civil suit seeking declaration of ownership over a commercial property claiming adverse



possession since November, 2011. Respondent No. 6 is stated to be the owner of the property against whom the adverse possession is being claimed.

3. Respondent filed an application under Section 151 CPC for restoring the electricity connection.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that immediately upon the receipt of summons of the suit, the petitioner got the electricity connection disconnected due to which the respondent was made to suffer without electricity in the shop.

5. Respondent filed an application before the trial Court for urgent relief of the restoration of the electricity in the shop, pursuant to which, the trial Court directed the petitioner and her husband to get the electricity connection restored within a period of five days. It is this order which has been impugned before this Court.

6. The main anxiety of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that respondent has not made payment of electricity charges for the previous period amounting to Rs. 30,000/- approximately, which the petitioner had to pay to the electricity department. According to him, in case the connection is restored in the name of petitioner, there is a possibility that respondent may not make the payment of electricity bill, and therefore, the liability for the payment of such bills would fall upon the petitioner.

7. Counsel for the respondent states that respondent is ready to pay Rs. 30,000/- towards the payment of electricity bill, as claimed by the petitioner.

8. In view of the said statement, learned counsel for the petitioner states that subject to receipt of such amount of Rs. 30,000/- from the respondent, petitioner has no objection to the grant of No Objection Certificate for the



installation of electricity meter in the name of the respondent.

9. With the consent of both sides, it is directed that upon receipt of amount of Rs. 30,000/- from the respondent, the petitioner shall issue the No Objection Certificate in favour of the respondent for installation of electricity meter. Upon installation of the electricity meter, the respondent shall make payment of electricity bills directly to the Power Company. Learned counsel of respondent undertakes that respondent shall pay Rs. 30,000/- to the petitioner through her counsel during the course of the day.

10. It is made clear that this order has been passed with consent of parties and not on the merits of the case. All rights and contentions of the parties are reserved.

11. Petition alongwith pending application is accordingly disposed of in terms of the aforesaid order.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

JANUARY 30, 2025/vp /ia