



**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WA No.58 of 2025

- 1. Tripura State Electricity Corporation Limited (TSECL), (Represented by the Chairman-cum-Managing Director, TSECL), Bidyut Bhaban, Banamalipur, Agartala, West Tripura, PIN-799001
- 2. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director, TSECL, Bidyut Bhaban, Banamalipur, Agartala, West Tripura, PIN-799001
- 3. The Senior Manager, Jogendranagar Electrical Sub Division, Office of the Senior Manager, Jogendranagar ESD, TSECL, Jogendranagar, Agartala, West Tripura, PIN-799004

.....Appellant(s);

Versus

- 1. Smt. Madhavi Biswas Chakraborty, Wife of Sri Koushik Chakraborty, resident of Bankumari, opposite of Khudiram Road, P.O. Agartala College, P.S. East Agartala, District- West Tripura, PIN-799004
- 2. Sri Kishore Chakraborty, Son of Late Kajal Chakraborty, presently residing at Flat No.1C, Block C, Rajib Gandhi path, Jyotikuchi, Kamrup Metropolitan, PIN-781040, Assam

.....Respondent(s)

For Appellant(s)	: Mr. Kushal Deb, Advocate, Mr. S. Saha, Advocate.
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. P. Roy Barman, Sr. Advocate, Mr. Samarjit Bhattacharjee, Advocate.

**HON’BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO
HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT**

Order

19/05/2026

Heard counsel for the parties.

- 2. Aggrieved by the direction of the learned Single Judge to provide electricity supply to the premises in occupation of the first respondent vide order dt. 05.03.2025 in WP(C) No.828/2024, this Writ Appeal is filed by the appellants.
- 3. The first respondent is the wife of one Koushik Chakraborty, and there are disputes between them, because of which the first respondent had



filed Misc.894/2023 before the Judicial Magistrate (First Class), Agartala, West Tripura under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (for short 'the Act') praying for relief under Sections 18, 19 and 20(d) of the said Act.

4. After the filing of the said case by her, a gift deed was executed by the father-in-law of the first respondent by name Kajal Chakraborty, who was the owner of the premises, in favour of his younger son Sri Kishore Chakraborty on 19.05.2023.

5. Counsel for the first respondent states that the Order in the DV Case where the Magistrate had declined grant of relief to the first respondent as regards her right of residence in the said premises, is now the subject matter of appeal before the Sessions Court.

6. A letter was thereafter written on 24.09.2024 by the father-in-law of the first respondent to the appellants stating that he is no longer residing in the said premises, and requesting disconnection of the electricity connection permanently.

7. Acting on the said letter and relying on Clause 8.8 of the Electricity Supply Code Regulation, 2011, the appellants had disconnected electricity supply to the subject premises.

8. The said Clause 8.8 states that in case a consumer desires his meter to be permanently disconnected, he shall apply for the same in the format prescribed in Annexure 11.15 to the Code.

9. The Electricity Supply Code Regulation, 2011 defines the term "Consumer" as a person who is supplied with electricity for his/her own use by a licensee such as the appellants.



10. In fact, at the time when the said letter was written by the father-in-law of the first respondent on 24.09.2024 to the appellants, he had ceased to be the owner of the premises since he had already executed a gift deed on 19.05.2023 in favour of his younger son Sri Kishore Chakraborty [respondent No.2].

11. In our opinion, he had no authority to address the said letter to the appellants when he was at that time not even the owner of the premises in question. The appellants could not have therefore disconnected the electricity connection to the premises on the basis of such a letter.

12. Even assuming that the electricity connection was in the name of the first respondent's father-in-law Kajal Chakraborty, to wreak revenge on the first respondent, he cannot be permitted to have the same disconnected in this manner when litigation is pending between his son and the first respondent.

13. Since the appeal filed by the first respondent is still pending consideration, we do not wish to express any opinion on the matter.

14. In our opinion, the learned Single Judge rightly interfered in the matter to prevent inconvenience and hardship to the first respondent, and therefore rightly directed the appellants to provide electricity supply to the subject premises where she is residing.

15. It is not in dispute that the first respondent is continuing to pay the electricity consumption charges, and the appellants have no grievance regarding that. It is also not the case of the appellants that there are any past dues in respect of the electricity connection provided to the said premises.



16. Therefore in the interest of justice, we do not deem it appropriate to interfere with the judgment of the learned Single Judge in the Writ Petition.

17. Nothing stated herein shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the DV Case, and the appeal filed by first respondent under the Act pending before the learned Sessions Judge, be decided in accordance with law, and the continuance of the electricity supply to the subject premises shall abide by the final result in the DV Case.

18. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

19. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(BISWAJIT PALIT, J)

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)



Pijush/

PIJUSH KANTI NAG Digitally signed by PIJUSH KANTI NAG
Date: 2026.05.21 14:39:20 +05'30'