

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19408 of 2017

=====

Izhar Alam son of Late Abdul Shakur resident of Registrar House, Satal Road, Bahadurganj, East of Central Bank, P.S. Bahadurganj, District - Kishanganj, At present residing at A/4 Anand Vihar Anishabad, P.O. - Anishabad, P.S. - Gardanibagh, District - Patna.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd. through its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Chairman-cum-Managing Director, Bihar State Power (Holding) Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
3. The General Manager-cum-Chief Engineer, Tirhut Electricity Supply Area, Muzaffarpur.
4. The General Manager, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd. Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
5. The Divisional General Manager (Revenue), North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
6. The Nodal Officer, Public Grievance Cell, North Bihar Power Distribution Company Ltd., Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
7. The Electrical Superintending Engineer, Purnea Electric Supply Circle, Purnea.
8. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Kishanganj.
9. The Executive Engineer (Revenue), Electric Supply Division, Kishanganj.
10. The Electrical Assistant Engineer (Revenue), Bahadurganj Electric Sub-Division, Bahadurganj.
11. The Electrical Junior Engineer, Electric Supply Officer, Bahadurganj.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Nityanand Mishra, Advocate
For the Power Company	: Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Sr. Advocate
	Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma, Adv.
	Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 01-05-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned
counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following
reliefs –



“(i) For issuance of appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions in the nature of mandamus commanding/directing the respondents to correct the electricity Bill and further to refund the excess paid bill amount along with compound interest to the petitioner which has been earlier paid by the petitioner to the respondent concerned.

(ii) Further to direct the respondents to pay the compensation for disconnection of the electricity even though the amount of the petitioner is due with the respondents which are still stand till date.

(iii) And further for direction to the respondents concerned to take action against the erring authorities/respondents and punish them in accordance with law, due to their fault the electricity connection of the petitioner was disconnected and excess money was recovered showing excess bill.

(iv) For any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner is entitled to in accordance with law.”

3. At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioner fairly accepts that statutory remedy by approaching the CGRF is available under Section 42(5) of the Electricity Act for redressal of his grievances.

4. This Court therefore, is not inclined to enter into the merits of the matter. The writ petition stands disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum with an appropriate application for redressal of his grievances.



If any such application is filed, the same shall be considered and disposed of in accordance with law.

(Vikash Jain, J)

B.T/Chandran

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	10.05.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

