



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CWP-3630-2026

Date of Decision: 08.04.2026

MAZID KHAN

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Nitin Verma, Advocate,
Mr. Sachin Jangra, Advocate and
Mr. Yash Lobra, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. Akshit Pathania, AAG, Haryana

Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate
For respondent Nos.2 to 4

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of assessment order dated 12.03.2016 whereby respondent has raised demand of electricity charges of Rs.5,79,908/- and compounding notice dated 12.03.2016 whereby respondent has proposed compounding fee.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Special Court has already discharged the petitioner, thus, there remains no liability against him. His case is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in ***“Rattan***

Singh Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.”, LawFinder Doc ID #2869383.



3. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that petitioner was discharged on the ground of limitation, thus, liability still exists.
4. As noticed in ***Rattan Singh (supra)***, it is Special Court which has to finally determine civil liability. The respondent filed criminal complaint making it clear that it was not a case of Section 126 but of Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003. In the absence of determination of civil liability by Special Court, the respondent has no authority to raise demand when prosecution has already failed.
5. Disposed of with liberty to respondent to avail remedy, with respect to civil liability, in accordance with Section 154 of Electricity Act, 2003.
6. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

08.04.2026
SDK

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No