

\$~28

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 20/2018**

AMAN CHOUHAN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitin Soni, Mrs. Puja B.Soni and
Mr. Rishi Kapoor, Advs.

versus

TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LTD. Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Srivastava, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER

%

03.01.2018

This petition has been filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:

“It is therefore most respectfully prayed that this Hon’ble Court may kindly in view of the facts and circumstances enumerated in this petition may:-

- (i) *Issue appropriate Writ order and / or direction and quash “Dues Intimation Letter “dated 5th September 2017 issued by the respondent to demand alleged arrears / dues of Rs.18,50,064/- in respect of some connection which never existed in property No.23, South Patel Nagar, New Delhi – 110008;*
- (ii) *Issue appropriate Writ Order and / or direction by virtue of which the respondent be directed to grant / sanction and install new temporary electricity connection in property No.23, South Patel Nagar, New Delhi – 110008;*
- (iii) *Any other writ order and / or direction which this Hon’ble Court may deem fit may also be passed in favour of petitioner.*

It is the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the

outstanding amount of Rs.18,50,064/- shown in terms of the impugned letter dated September 5, 2017 is in the name of Satnam Singh. According to him, Satnam Singh has never been the occupant / owner of property in question i.e. House No. 23, South Patel Nagar, New Delhi. He also states despite a legal notice dated October 3, 2017, respondent has not responded to the same. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner states, he would be satisfied if the respondent consider the writ petition as a representation and pass a speaking order. He also states before passing any order, the respondent should give a hearing to the petitioner so as to enable the petitioner, clarify doubts, if any. This suggestion is acceptable to the learned counsel for the respondent who is appearing on advance notice. He also states, the date and time of hearing shall be intimated to the petitioner. According to him, a speaking order shall be passed within two weeks after the date of hearing.

Noting the submissions made, it is directed that the respondent shall consider the writ petition as a representation by giving a hearing to the petitioner within 10 days from today and pass a speaking order within two weeks thereafter. It goes without saying, if the petitioner is still aggrieved by the order to be passed, he shall seek such remedy as available to him in accordance with law.

Petition is disposed of.

Dasti.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

JANUARY 03, 2018/jg