



\$~36

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CS(OS) 661/2023**

CHANDEEP SINGH SAWHNEY

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harkirat Singh, Adv.

versus

RAVINDER KUMAR AHUJA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Abhishek Singh, Mr. J. Amal Anand, Mr. Elvin Joshy, Ms. Shivani Kalra, Mr. K.V. Vibu Prasad and Mr. Akshat Mishra, Advs. with D-1 in person.

Mr. Abhishek Sisodia and Mr. Anurag Sharma, Advs for D-8.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

22.06.2026

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

I.A. 16103/2026

2. An application has been filed on behalf of Defendant No. 8 under Section 151 CPC seeking directions for immediate restoration of electricity supply to the premises occupied by the Defendants and for restraining the Plaintiff and Defendant No. 1 from forcibly dispossessing the Defendants.

3. Learned counsel for the Applicant/Defendant No. 8 submits that for the last three weeks, the electricity supply to the premises occupied by Defendant No. 8 has been disconnected by the Plaintiff and Defendant No.

4. Learned counsel for the Applicant further submits that a Coordinate Bench of this Court, *vide* order dated 12.01.2024, had directed all the parties



to maintain *status quo*.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel appearing for Defendant No. 1, who appears on advance notice, submits that in the order dated 12.01.2024, this Court had referred to a civil suit pending between the parties before the Saket Courts.

6. He further submits that in Civil Suit, a similar application seeking identical reliefs was moved by Defendant No. 8 in the year 2021 and the same was dismissed for non-prosecution *vide* order dated 12.12.2023.

7. It is further submitted that Defendant No. 8 had also moved a similar application before the learned Trial Court, which remained unprosecuted for nearly two years and was ultimately dismissed. It is contended that the present application has been filed without any fresh cause of action.

8. Learned counsel further submits that the present application does not disclose the date on which the alleged disconnection of electricity took place. It is contended that the application has been filed only to frustrate the decree passed by the learned Trial Court in the civil suit. It is further submitted that this Court has already directed that the decree passed by the learned Trial Court shall not be executed without the leave of this Court and an appropriate application in that regard has already been filed before the Coordinate Bench.

9. A perusal of the record shows that the present application does not disclose the date on which the electricity supply to the premises was allegedly disconnected.

10. *Prima facie*, it appears that Defendant No. 8 has been repeatedly moving similar applications. Earlier also, a similar application was filed before the learned Trial Court and was dismissed for non-prosecution. The present application has likewise been filed without disclosing the cause of



action and without furnishing material particulars regarding the alleged disconnection of electricity.

11. At this stage, no ground is made out for passing any direction as prayed for.

12. List on 19.08.2026 before the Roster Bench, the date already fixed.

CS(OS)-661/2023

13. List on 19.08.2026 before the Roster Bench, the date already fixed.

14. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

**MADHU JAIN, J.
(VACATION JUDGE)**

JUNE 22, 2026/JYH/P