



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 13TH DAY OF JULY, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

WRIT PETITION NO. 4181 OF 2026 (GM-KEB)

BETWEEN:

MRS. LIDIYA SHANTH KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS,
W/O. SHANTHKUMAR,
NO.758/84, POLICE QUARTERS,
ROAD 1 MAIN, K.G NAGAR,
BENGALURU-91

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. RAJAGOPALA NAIDU, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
BESCOM, K2
HEROHALLI SUB-DIVISION,
MAGADI MAIN ROAD, TUNGANAGAR,
BENGALURU-560 091

2. MRS.JAYALAKSHMI,
AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS,
W/O.LATE PUTTASWAMY GOWDA,
NO.758/84, POLICE QUARTERS,
ROAD 1ST MAIN, K.G NAGAR,
BENGALURU-91

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI.VINAYAKA V.S., ADVOCATE)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLE 227 OF
THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO DIRECTING THE
1ST RESPONDENT TO CONSIDER REPRESENTATION
DATED:16/10/2025 AS PER ANNEXURE-F BY CONTINUING



THE POWER CONNECTION TILL THE REGULAR POWER CONNECTION IS ALLOTTED TO THE BUILDING BY IGNORING ENDORSEMENTS ANNEXURE-G DATED:07/11/2025 BEARING NO.SAKAANI(E0)/SA LE/KE2/2025-26 AND ANNEXURE-J DATED: 20/12/2025 SEEKING NOC FROM THE 2ND RESPONDENT BEARING NO SAKAANI(E0)/SA,E(TAA)/KE2/2025-26.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

ORAL ORDER

The present writ petition is filed seeking the following prayer:

"PRAYER

WHEREFORE, the Petitioner prays that this Hon'ble court be pleased to:-

- i) Issue a Writ of mandamus directing the 1st respondent to consider representation dated 16/10/2025 as per "ANNEXURE-F" by continuing the power connection till the regular power connection is allotted to the building by ignoring endorsements "ANNEXURE-G" dated 07/11/2025 bearing no SAKAANI(E0)/SA LE/KE2/2025-26 and "ANNEXURE-J" dated 20/12/2025 Seeking NOC from the 2nd respondent bearing o SAKAANI (E0)SA,E(TAA)/KE2/2025-26.***
- ii) Issue writ of mandamus directing the 1st respondent not to disconnect the power connection to the premises of the petitioner.***
- iii) Issue any other writ or direction or any relief that this Hon'ble Court deems fit to grant in the facts and circumstances of the case including the order as to costs;"***



2. The petitioner's case is that she is a tenant of the 2nd respondent herein. The petitioner's landlord received a security deposit of Rs.27,00,000/- and placed the petitioner in possession of the house. At the time of handing over possession, the building was unfinished, and the 2nd respondent had requested the petitioner to carry out the remaining construction work at the petitioner's cost and to recover the same from the 2nd respondent. Accordingly, the petitioner has spent a sum of Rs.3,00,000/-. The 2nd respondent had intimated the 1st respondent to withdraw the temporary power connection to the property, though the petitioner was paying the consumption charges. However, the 1st respondent insisted on an NOC from the landlord to allow the petitioner to enjoy the power connection. The petitioner, on 15.04.2022, requested the 2nd respondent, her children, and the 1st respondent to continue the temporary power connection. However, the NOC has not been issued by the 2nd respondent. As such, WP.No.10913/2022 came to be filed before this Court. Based on their submissions, the Court considered the petitioner's representation and restored the temporary power connection on 14.03.2022. It is the case that the 2nd



respondent and her children have removed the electricity meter from the premises on 10.09.2024. Immediately, the petitioner, in her representation dated 10.09.2024, requested the 1st respondent to restore the power connection by fixing the meter inside the premises. The petitioner also filed O.S.No.19/2024 against the 2nd respondent and her children for a permanent injunction when they tried to dispossess her from the property.

3. The petitioner also filed WP.No.27827/2024 before this Court seeking a mandatory injunction against the 1st respondent. By order dated 08.09.2025, this Court directed the petitioner to furnish all requisite documents to the 1st respondent. It is stated that on 16.10.2025, the petitioner submitted a representation enclosing documents such as the rental agreement, the plaint in O.S.No.19/2024, and the termination notice issued by respondent No.2 to the 1st respondent. Instead of considering the representations dated 16.10.2025, the 1st respondent, on 07.11.2025, refused on the ground that the lease deed had expired. In her representation dated 26.11.2025, the petitioner clarified to the 1st respondent that the suit for injunction was filed against the 2nd respondent and her children, and that the same is also pending. It is stated



that the expiry of the lease period will not come in the way of the petitioner continuing in the property until he is evicted in accordance with law. Further, the 2nd respondent is not prepared to renew the lease agreement in view of the pendency of the suit and the termination notice issued. All these facts have been brought to the notice of the 1st respondent, requesting the restoration of the temporary power connection that existed earlier. It is the case that the 1st respondent, once again on 20.12.2025, issued an endorsement to produce the NOC from the 2nd respondent and refused to restore the temporary power connection. Hence, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that there are disputes between the petitioner and the 2nd respondent herein. Though the petitioner has submitted all requisite documents, respondent No.1 is still insisting on the lease deed, which the petitioner will not be able to furnish due to the disputes between the parties. It is submitted that respondent No.1 ought to have considered the representation and ought to have restored the power supply, and this has been going on for years. Hence, it is submitted that the writ



petition may be allowed by directing the respondents to consider the representation as prayed before this Court.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.1, on instructions, submits that the 2nd respondent has mortgaged the property in favour of Muthoot Finance, and Muthoot Finance has taken possession of the property. Now, the petitioner seeks restoration of the power supply and she is not in possession. It is submitted that there is no lease agreement, and that itself was terminated in the year 2023. As per the procedure invogue, they have asked for the documents. It is submitted that if the petitioner fulfils the criteria for granting the power connection/supply under KERC COS Rule 4.02, and complies with the same, respondent No.1 has no objection for restoring the power supply.

6. In response to that, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, even if the lease is not extended, unless and until due process is followed and he is evicted from the premises, the power supply has to be restored.

7. Having heard the learned counsels on either side, perused the material on record. From the material on record, it



appears that there are disputes between the petitioner and respondent No.2. This Court is not concerned with the *inter se* disputes between the petitioner and respondent No.2. The respondents are bound by the KERC Rules, and the party seeking a power connection, whether temporary or permanent, has to fulfil the conditions. It is not for the petitioner to say that the respondent No.1 should not insist on the NOC or any other documents. Whatever the regulations require, it is for the party to comply with them. There cannot be any exception to the procedure. In that view of the matter, without expressing anything on the merits of the matter, this Court is passing the following:

ORDER

- i. The respondent No.1 shall consider the petitioner's representation dated 16.10.2025 in accordance with law within a period of 10 days from the receipt of the copy of the order.
- ii. The petitioners shall submit the required documents and as per the endorsement, if he is not able to submit any particular document, it is for respondent No.1 to pass appropriate orders.



- iii. Before passing orders, respondent No.1 shall issue notice to the 2nd respondent herein.
- iv. Accordingly, the writ petition is ***disposed of.***
- v. All I.As. in this petition shall stand closed.

SD/-
(LALITHA KANNEGANTI)
JUDGE

MEG
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 8