



221-46

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

RSA-1312-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 01.08.2025

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LTD & ... Appellant(s)
ANR

Versus

M/S M.L. SPINNERS PVT LTD ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present: Mr. B.R. Mahajan, Senior Advocate with
Mr. S.K. Mahajan, Advocate for the appellant(s).

Mr. Arun Luthra, Advocate
for the respondent(s).

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The defendant-appellants are in the present Regular Second Appeal, challenging the judgment and decree passed by the First Appellate Court whereby the appeal filed by the plaintiff-respondent was allowed and the judgment and decree passed by the Trial Court dismissing the suit of the plaintiff-respondent was set aside.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for the defendant-appellants has submitted that the question of law involved in the present appeal as to whether jurisdiction of the Civil Court is barred in view of Section 145 of the Electricity Act, 2003, has since been decided by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **RSA-4181-2016** titled as "**Mahesh Kumar Versus Sub Divisional Officer & Anr.**" vide judgment dated 14.05.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the plaintiff-respondent does not dispute this factual position.

4. In view thereof, the present appeal is allowed, and the suit filed by the plaintiff-respondent stands dismissed on the ground of jurisdiction. However, the plaintiff-respondent would have the liberty to avail the remedies as available in law.

5. It is made clear that any evidence recorded/observations made in the impugned judgments and decrees would not operate as *res judicata* in any subsequent proceedings initiated by the plaintiff-respondent. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

01.08.2025

jk

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking

Whether reportable: YES/NO