

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.22747 of 2013

=====

Jagdish Singh, Son of Late Jagdhar Singh, Resident of Village Diwanganj,
P.O. Rautara, P.S. Purna Rural, O.P. Ranipatara, District Purnea
..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar State Electricity Board through Chairman Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
 2. General Manager, North Bihar, Power Distribution Company Limited, Purnea
 3. Superintending Engineer, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd. Purnea
 4. Executive Engineer, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Purnea
 5. Assistant Engineer, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Purnea Rural Purnea
 6. A.E.F. Revenue, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Purnea Rural Ranipatra, Purnea
..... Respondent/s
- =====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ratan Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. S. K. Giri, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SAMARENDRA PRATAP SINGH
ORAL ORDER

7 24-11-2015 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the Power Holding company.

The petitioner seeks quashing of the Electricity Bill as contained in Annexure-3 Series, whereby he has been directed to pay energy bill to the tune of Rs.67,000/- and odd.

The petitioner submits that he applied for electric connection in the year 2002. His grievance is that no electric connection was provided, still a bill for a sum of Rs.67000/- and odd has been raised.

Counsel for the Power Holding Company submits that for agriculture connection, no meter is installed.

A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of Power Holding Company. In para 6 of the counter affidavit, it is stated that the petitioner applied for new electric connection after completing the necessary formalities and paid the requisite fees on 15.06.2002. In para 7 it is stated that periodical bills were raised under agriculture category and true copy of the ledger book has been enclosed as Annexure-A to the counter affidavit.

However, the petitioner in reply submits that the respondent nowhere has stated on which date the electric connection has been provided. He submits that there was no wire connection.

In case, no ready connection was provided, the respondents cannot be justified to be raised a bill. In this view of the matter, I find it expedient to remit the matter to respondent no.4, who would settle the issue within four weeks from the date of filing of a copy of this order along with representation. In case, the respondent no.4 finds that in fact no electric connection was provided, he would withdraw the bills raised against the petitioner.

With the aforesaid observation, this application is disposed of.

(Samarendra Pratap Singh, J.)

Uday/-

U			
---	--	--	--