

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.01.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE T.RAJA

W.P.No.1649 of 2017

P.Kumari

.. Petitioner

-vs-

1. The Asst. Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Pallavaram East
Chennai South
Chennai 600 043

2. R.Balaji

3. R.Baskaran ... Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the first respondent proceedings letter No.U.Po.E & Pa./Pa.Ki.F.Complaint/D312 dated 27.10.2014, to quash the same and direct the first respondent to provide separate service connection to the petitioner portion situates at No.2/65, New No.4/32, Bajanai Koil Street, Thirisoolam, Chennai 600 043 without insisting the court order.

For Petitioner :: Mr.K.Kannan

For Respondents :: Mr.S.K.Rameshuwar for R1

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed on the ground that the petitioner should be provided with a separate electricity service connection in addition to the one enjoyed by her in Service Connection No.092462611737.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that with the existing electricity service connection given in the name of the petitioner, her brothers, illegally, discreetly and surreptitiously, by laying unapproved cable line, are enjoying the service connection, as a result her consumption charges are unreasonably inflated. Secondly, she has also filed a suit in O.S.No.141 of 2014 on the file of the Sub Court, Tambaram asking for partition and the same is pending. Therefore, she wants to

have a separate electricity service connection.

3. But this Court is not able to find any merit in the writ petition. When the petitioner has already been enjoying the electricity connection in Service Connection No.092462611737, on the ground that her brothers are discreetly tapping electricity from her meter through unapproved cable line, she cannot seek a direction to the first respondent to provide a separate service connection. When it is the categorical case of the petitioner that her brothers are having separate electricity connection for their house, the complaint of the petitioner that she is made to pay the inflated consumption charges is not well founded. Moreover, it is not known whether the petitioner has got merits in the pending suit. On these grounds, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition seeking a direction to the electricity board to provide a separate electricity service connection to the petitioner. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

-s/d-

Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

ss
To

1. The Asst. Engineer
Tamilnadu Electricity Board
Pallavaram East
Chennai South
Chennai 600 043

+1 cc to Mr.S.K.Rameshuwar Advocate sr 4383

सत्यमेव जयते

W.P.No.1649 of 2017

ug(co)
aa27/02/2017

WEB COPY