

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.860 of 2014

=====

Pinki Devi wife of Sri Baidyanath Sharma, resident of Mohalla- Bela Shankar, Police Station - L.N. Mithila University, Darbhanga Town, District - Darbhanga

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna through Its Chairman-Cum-Managing Director
2. Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna
3. North Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna through its Managing Director
4. Managing Director, North Bihar Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Vidyut Bhawan, Jawahar Lal Nehru Marg, Patna
5. Electrical Superintending Engineer, Electric Supply Circle, Darbhanga
6. Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Division, Darbhanga (Urban), District - Darbhanga
7. Electrical Assistant Engineer, Electric Supply Sub Division, Darbhanga Town, District - Darbhanga

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance:

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gyanand Roy, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate
Mr. Prakash Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
ORAL ORDER

3 12-03-2015 Learned counsel for the parties are present.

The writ petition has been filed praying for restoration of the electricity line of the petitioner which stood disconnected since 9.5.2013 as well as questioning the punitive bill to the tune of Rs. 1,02,000/-. While the matter remained pending before this Court, an application was filed by the petitioner before the Electrical Executive Engineer on 23.12.2014, a copy of which is placed at Annexure-R/3 whereby she has undertaken to pay the punitive bill amount of Rs. 1,02,000/- and which deposit would be subject to

the final outcome of the proceedings pending before the Special Court pursuant to the FIR instituted by the respondent company.

It is admitted at the bar by Mr. Gyanand Roy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that abiding by the undertaking given by the petitioner in Annexure-R/3 she has deposited the punitive bill amount and the line of the petitioner has been restored.

Although an attempt was made by Mr. Roy to question the punitive bill but considering the fact that the matter lies pending before the Special Court and it has been the admission of the petitioner herself that the deposit would be subject to the final outcome of such proceedings which also vests the special court to determine the civil liability, this Court is of the opinion that nothing further survives in the writ petition which is accordingly disposed of.

It goes without saying that the deposit so made by the petitioner would be governed by the final outcome of the proceedings pending before the Special Court.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

S.Sb/-

U			
---	--	--	--