

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2026.PHHC:054753



CWP No.31535-2025(O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.04.2026

Pushpa Sharma

....Petitioner

vs.

Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Kamal Sharma, Advocate
Mr. Himanshu Satia, Advocate for
Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Ravish Kaushik, Advocate
for the respondents

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of Electricity Bill (Annexure P-9) whereby respondent has raised demand of electricity charges of Rs.25,87,234/-.

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 judgment of this Court in “***Rattan Singh Vs. State of Haryana & Ors.***”, ***LawFinder Doc ID #2869383***.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents fails to dispute that petitioner stands acquitted by Special Court.

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

09.04.2026
paramjit

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	
Whether reportable:	Y	No