



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

**CWP-14804-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.05.2026**

Sanjeev Mohan Singh Liberhan

...Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Hemant Bassi, Senior Advocate with
 Ms. Gursimran Kaur, Advocate and
 Ms. Saloni Chhabra, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

 Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate
 for the respondent-UHBVN.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of action of respondents towards restoration of electricity connection in favour of respondent No. 5. He is further seeking setting aside of impugned order dated 14.10.2025 along with direction to respondent to disconnect electricity connection installed in the demised premises.

2. Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent-UHBVN and filed his power of attorney. Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place on the case file.

3. As per petition, the petitioner claims himself owner of the demised property. His mother let out a portion of premises to a tenant

named Kesar Mal. After the death of Kesar Mal, his son Vijay Kumar became the tenant. The petitioner in the capacity of being a co-owner along with his mother filed an eviction petition. He approached Learned Rent Controller, Ambala who vide judgment dated 29.11.2019 ordered to evict the Vijay Kumar-respondent No.5 from demised premises. Vijay Kumar preferred appeal before Appellate Authority which came to be dismissed vide order dated 21.08.2024. The petitioner initiated execution proceedings. Warrant of possession was issued and physical possession of the demised premises was delivered to the petitioner through Court Bailiff on 18.02.2025. Respondent No.5 approached this Court by way of **CR-6306-2024** which was dismissed vide order dated 24.04.2025. Upon obtaining possession, petitioner got the electricity connection disconnected on 09.07.2025. Respondent authorities restored the electricity connection in favour of Respondent No.5 on 12/13.07.2025. Petitioner made several representations but to no avail. The respondent has further passed impugned order dated 14.10.2025.

4. Learned counsel representing the respondent- submits that it is factually correct that petitioner's tenant is not in possession of demised premises and has already been removed from the demised premises in execution proceedings.

5. On being confronted with Section 43 of Electricity Act, 2003, he concedes that electricity connection can be released to owner or occupier of any premises and at present tenant is neither owner nor occupier of the demised premises.

6. In the backdrop, the petition stands ***disposed of*** with a direction to respondent not to release electricity connection in favour of

respondent No.5 unless and until he furnishes evidence of ownership or occupation *qua* demised premises.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

26.05.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No