



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

122

CR-9268-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision:-15.01.2026

Mukesh Kumar Vishawkarma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Uttar Haryana Vijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. Balkar Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Ms. Dheerja, Advocate,
for the respondents.

AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeking setting aside of the impugned order dated 18.11.2025 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Sonapat (Annexure P-4), whereby the application filed by the petitioner/plaintiff for leading additional evidence has been dismissed.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner/plaintiff, Mukesh Kumar Vishwakarma, filed a suit for declaration and permanent injunction against the respondents in respect of alleged theft of Electricity Connection No. KU-27-1624-L. During the pendency of the said suit, it came to the knowledge of the petitioner that the aforesaid meter connection had been wrongly mentioned as Electricity Connection No. KU-27-1624-L instead of the correct Electricity Connection No.



KU-87-1012-L. Accordingly, the petitioner moved an application for leading additional evidence seeking correction of the meter number from KU-27-1624-L to KU-87-1012-L. Prior thereto, the petitioner/plaintiff was under the impression that his meter number had been correctly mentioned and he had been pursuing the litigation on that basis. Subsequently, upon realizing that the said meter number did not pertain to his connection, he filed the application for additional evidence. Reply thereto was filed by the respondents. However, the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Sonapat, dismissed the said application on the ground that, as per the petitioner's own case, the connection number KU-87-1012-L had inadvertently and due to a typographical error been mentioned as connection number KU-27-1624-L.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order passed by the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Sonapat, deserves to be set aside in the interest of justice and that the petitioner be afforded an opportunity to lead additional evidence by allowing the present revision petition.

4. Notice of motion.

5. Ms. Dheerja, Advocate, has appeared and accepts notice on behalf of respondents and prays for dismissal of the present revision petition.

6. Keeping in view the above, this Court is of the opinion that the application for leading additional evidence ought to have been allowed instead of dismissing the same, as the learned Civil Judge



(Junior Division), Sonapat, could have arrived at a proper conclusion in view of the pleadings and the facts and circumstances of the present case. Accordingly, the present revision petition is allowed and the impugned order dated 18.11.2025 (Annexure P-4) is set aside. The petitioner is permitted to lead additional evidence. The petitioner shall appear before the learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Sonapat, on the date fixed, who shall afford an opportunity to the petitioner to lead additional evidence on the issue.

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

(AMARINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

15.01.2026
anil

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether Reportable:-	Yes/No