

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 1733 of 2020

1. Satdeep Singh Arora, S/o Tavinderpal Singh Arora, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Dayalband Bilaspur, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

1. Chhattisgarh State Power Distribution Company Ltd. (C.S.P.D.C.L.) Through Managing Director, Head Office Daganiya, Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. Assistant Engineer, C.S.P.D.C.L. Division Dayalband, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

----- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Arvind Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondents	:	None

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Order on Board

02.09.2020

1. The grievance of the petitioner seems to be the alleged bills which have been raised by the Respondents upon the petitioner showing that there are arrears of bill unpaid on the part of the petitioner.
2. That all the petitioner in the present writ petition has approached this Court seeking for a limited relief of a direction to the respondents to consider his representation that he has made, giving details of bills and previous payments made by him. According to the petitioner, there is no arrears left for the petitioner to be paid, yet however, the respondents have raised a bill showing arrears.
3. The counsel for the petitioner undertakes that subject to verification of the records, if the petitioner is still found to pay certain arrears, the

petitioner shall abide-by the orders passed by the respondents reserving his rights of challenging the same, if it is not acceptable to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that let the respondents continue accepting the regular bills, which are raised and meanwhile the representations which each of the petitioner made, so far as the objection pertaining to the arrears part is concerned, be decided at the earliest. According to the counsel for the petitioner, all the bills which have been raised by the respondent-company till date have been duly cleared by the petitioner and the present bill showing arrears of payment was never before raised by the respondents nor have they clarified in-any-manner as to the details of the arrears part that is how much arrears was left unpaid for which of the months etc. and it is this information, which has been sought for by the petitioner through his representation.

4. The contention of all the petitioner is that he has never ever defaulted in the payment of the bills that have been raised by the respondents hence he is surprised to get a bill now showing huge amount of arrears.
5. All that the demand of the petitioner is that as of now let the respondent no. 2 provide the details of the arrears so as to get the same verified and crossed checked from their records before making the payments.
6. Considering the total facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the opinion that the entire writ petition itself can be disposed off

with a direction to the Respondent No. 1 and 2 to immediately process the representation that has been filed by the petitioner and, the respondent no. 2 may also provide the details of the calculation; so far as the arrears of unpaid bills, if any to the petitioner is concerned. Meanwhile, the respondents are directed to accept the regular payments to be made by the petitioner from the regular bills that would be raised by the respondent-company. Subject to the decision to be taken on the representations of the petitioner, the petitioner would be at liberty to either deposit the arrears of bill as calculated or if he is aggrieved, he should challenge the same before the appropriate forum established under the Electricity Act dealing with disputes relating to electricity bills.

7. It is further ordered that as of now since each of the petitioner has already made his representation to the respective respondents and a decision on the same is yet to be taken, it is ordered that till the respondents take a decision on the representations of the petitioner, no coercive steps shall be taken against the petitioner for the arrears of the bills, which have been raised by the respondents.
8. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed off.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge