

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA**WRIT PETITION NO. 200 OF 2020**

SHYAM SATARDEKAR.,

... Petitioner*Versus*STATE OF GOA, THR. CHIEF SECRETARY
AND 4 ORS.,**... Respondents**

Mr. Ashwin D. Bhobe, Advocate with Ms. Kalpa D. Govenkar,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Devidas J. Pangam, Advocate General with Ms. Maria S. J.
Correia, Additional Government Advocate for the Respondents.

**Coram : M. S. SONAK &
SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, JJ.**

Date : 11th March, 2020.

Oral Order: (Per M. S. Sonak, J.)

Heard Mr. Bhobe, learned Counsel for the Petitioner.
Mr. Devidas J. Pangam, learned Advocate General alongwith Ms.
Maria S.J. Correia, appear for the Respondents.

2. The learned Advocate General makes a statement that, in
the present case, the Petitioner, through a licensed electrical

contractor, may install a transformer and other cables at the location already indicated by the Petitioner, no doubt, at his own cost. The cables will have to be laid from the nearest tapping point, which will be at a distance approximately 160-170 metres from the location of the transformer. The learned Advocate General states that within a period of 7 days from such installation, necessary electricity connection will be released to the building of the Petitioner.

4. The learned Advocate General also states that the Petitioner, will have to pay an amount of ₹87,229/- towards supervision charges in respect of the supervision which the concerned Respondents will have to undertake in the matter.

5. Mr. Bhobe, learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that the supervision charges as aforesaid will be paid immediately, and further, the Petitioner will undertake the necessary work of installation as aforesaid.

6. By accepting the aforesaid statement made by the learned Advocate General and by directing the Respondents to act accordingly, we dispose of this Petition. However, before we do so, we must say that the impugned communication dated 23.12.2019 issued by the Assistant Engineer (O&M), Quepem, is not at all proper. Merely because some complaints may have been received or

merely because some matters may be pending in the Court, in the absence of any injunction from the Court, the Assistant Engineer (O&M), should not have declined to release the power supply to the building of the Petitioner. We note this because the Petitioner, had earlier instituted a petition requiring Respondents to consider his pending application for release of electricity connection and the same has been disposed of by issuing directions for expeditious consideration.

7. The Petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

msr.