

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.564 of 2015

=====

Manoj Kumar Saw, son of Late Bihari Sah, resident of Mahesh Nagar (Near Nala), Police Station - Patliputra, District – Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Bihar State Electricity Board through Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna.
2. The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna.
3. The Assistant Electrical Engineer, Electricity Supply Division, Sri Krishnapuri, Patna.
4. The Executive Engineer Electrical, Electricity Supply Division, Patliputra, Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gautam Kumar Yadav

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 05-08-2016

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is permitted to add the Executive Engineer Electrical, Electricity Supply Division, Patliputra, Patna, as respondent no.4 to the present proceedings during the course of the day.

Heard Mr. Gautam Kumar Yadav, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent Electric Company.

The limited prayer made by the petitioner is for an appropriate direction to the respondent authorities to examine the meter of the petitioner and if found defective, to change the same and also to provide a correct bill accordingly. The reason for the grievance raised is the inspection report present at Annexure-1 which though shows a connected load within the sanctioned load but the meter records a higher load of 8.60 KW.

According to Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel

appearing for the respondent Electric Company, the load sanctioned to the petitioner was 8 HP but the meter records a demand of about 11 HP which is more than the contract demand.

Mr. Yadav, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner with reference to the faulty functioning of the meter submits that a representation for inspection of the business premises was filed by the petitioner which was received by the Assistant Electrical Engineer, Electricity Supply Division, Sri Krishnapuri, Patna on 25.1.2014 but has remained pending. He submits that the provisional bill present at Annexure-2 has also been paid by the petitioner though a bit late in January, 2015.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of the grievance raised, I deem it fit and proper to dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the Executive Engineer Electrical, Electricity Supply Division, Patliputra, the newly added respondent herein to consider the grievance and get the meter of the petitioner tested in accordance with law. An early disposal preferably within a period of three months of receipt/production of a copy of this order would serve the purpose.

The writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

deepika/-

NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	22.8.2016
Transmission Date	