



258

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

**RSA-1695-2024 (O&M)  
Date of Decision : 19.09.2025**

DHBVNL AND ANR ... Appellants

Versus

PAWAN @ RINKU ... Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**

Present: Mr. B.R. Mahajan, Senior Advocate with  
Mr. Madhur Singh, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Arman Goyal, Advocate for the respondent.

**ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)**

1. The defendant-appellants are in present Regular Second Appeal, challenging the judgment and decree passed by the First Appellate Court whereby their appeal was dismissed, and the judgment and decree passed by the Trial Court in favour of the plaintiff-respondent was affirmed.

2. At the outset, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of 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 and Another**' 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 stands disposed off.

19.09.2025  
*Aman Jain*

**(ALKA SARIN)**  
**JUDGE**

*NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking*  
*Whether reportable: YES/NO*