



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

CWP-14778-2026 (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 Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside the decision of restoration of electricity connection to respondent No.5-Marcelino Norana. He is further seeking setting aside of order dated 14.10.2025 (Annexure P-10) and 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 premises. He let out a portion of his premises to a tenant namely

Ursula. After a period of time she left the premises and got settled abroad. Respondent No.5-Relative of earlier tenant-Ursula occupied the premises without petitioner's consent. He approached Learned Rent Controller, Ambala who vide judgment dated 25.01.2024 ordered to evict the respondent No.5 from demised premises. Respondent No.5 preferred appeal before Appellate Authority which dismissed the prayer for stay vide order dated 22.05.2025. The petitioner initiated execution proceedings. Warrant of possession was issued and physical possession of the premises was delivered to the petitioner through Court Bailiff on 26.05.2025. Respondent No.5 approached this Court by way of **CR-3300-2025** which was dismissed vide order dated 29.05.2025 as having been rendered infructuous. Petitioner claims that respondent No.5 on earlier occasion got the electricity connection transferred in his name without lawful entitlement. Upon getting the possession, he 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-UHBNV has further passed impugned order dated 14.10.2025.

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