

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.16788 of 2015

=====

Rang Bahadur Rai S/o Late Dhanukdhari Rai R/o Village Gori, P.s. Kargahar, Dist. Rohtas A/p residing at Civil Line, Ward No. 2, Sasaram, P.S. Sasaram, Dist. Rohtas

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna through its Chairman
2. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Bihar State Electricity Board, Patna
3. Chief Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Sasaram, Rohtas
4. Superintending Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Sasaram, Rohtas
5. Executive Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Sasaram, Rohtas
6. Assistant Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Subdivision, Sasaram, Rohtas
7. J.E., Electric Supply Sub-Division, Sasaram, Rohtas

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Mahesh Prasad, Advocate
		Mr. Rewti Kant Raman, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Senior Advocate
		Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate
		Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 26-10-2018

The present writ petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 18.12.2014 passed by the District Consumer Forum, Rohtas, Sasaram by which the same has been rejected on the ground that he has chosen wrong forum; and for a direction to the respondents to comply the order dated 15.05.2007 passed by this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 1406 of 2004 and refund the excess amount realized as energy duty from the petitioner by the respondents as same has been deposited with protest as electric connection was going to be disconnected at the time of deposit.



2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that owing to inadvertent mistake, the petitioner moved the District Consumer Forum instead of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum constituted under the Electricity Act as observed in the order dated 02.02.2011 passed by this Court in M.J.C. No.1147 of 2008 (Annexure-4).

3. Having regard to the nature of the grievance of the petitioner, this Court is of the view that no further order is required to be passed. If the petitioner approached the incorrect Forum through inadvertence, no fault can be found with the order passed by such Forum rejecting the petitioner's application. Instead of approaching the correct Forum, the petitioner has straight way approached this Court. It is for the petitioner to approach the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum for redressal of his grievances and satisfy the Forum for any delay caused by pursuing the remedy before a wrong Forum.

4. The writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid observations.

(Vikash Jain, J)

N.H./- B.T.

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	27-10-2018
Transmission Date	N/A

