

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. KANTHA RAO

W.P.No.3260 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondents 1 to 4.

This Writ Petition is filed seeking to declare the action of the respondents in collecting penalty of more than three times over and above the actual electricity consumption charges in respect of the petitioner's service connection, as arbitrary and illegal.

The petitioner is the owner and possessor of plot No.70, Kalyanpuri Colony, Uppal, Hyderabad. After obtaining permission, the petitioner constructed building and also obtained municipal number and has been paying the house tax. Thereafter, the petitioner applied for electricity connection for the said house and the respondent-authorities accorded permission and he was given electricity connection. While so, the respondent-authorities have been issuing electricity bills by assessing three times of consumption charges more than the actual tariff fixed by the Andhra Pradesh Electricity Regulatory Commission on the ground of non-production of occupancy certificate. Hence, the writ petition.

The grievance of the petitioner is that as per Section 62 of the Electricity Act, 2003, the Commission shall

determine and fix tariff and the respondents have to collect the charges as per tariff, but they cannot charge more than the prescribed tariff.

In similar set of facts and circumstances, learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.32906 of 2014, held as under:

“In this view of the matter, demand and collection of electricity consumption charges at three times the normal charges from the petitioner cannot be sustained and the same is declared as illegal. The respondents are directed to adjust the excess tariff, if any, collected so far, from the petitioner’s future C.C. bills.

Before closing this case, this Court feels it imperative to observe that the petitioner cannot violate law and insist on the power distribution licensee to continue to supply power to it without obtaining Occupancy Certificate, which, admittedly, is a mandatory requirement under Section 455 of the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act, 1955. The respondents are, therefore, left free to call upon the petitioner to produce the Occupancy Certificate in accordance with the said provision within a stipulated time. If the petitioner fails to produce such certificate, they shall be free to disconnect the power supply to him and terminate the power supply agreement. The respondents are also left free to refuse release of power supply to other similarly situated consumers if they fail to produce Occupancy Certificates within a stipulated time.”

As the issue involved in this writ petition is identical and squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment of this Court, this writ petition is also disposed of in terms thereof. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE R. KANTHA RAO

16th February, 2015
rkk