

(1) 201.Wps.3059,3060,3061,3062,3063.10

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.3059 OF 2010

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., (MSEDCL)

Vs.

Mohd. Idu Haji Subrati and another.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.3060 OF 2010

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., (MSEDCL)

Vs.

Ashwin Anupkumar Shravagi and another.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.3061 OF 2010

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., (MSEDCL)

Vs.

Sau. Archana W/o Naresh Bhutada and another.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.3062 OF 2010

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., (MSEDCL)

Vs.

Gokuldas L. Chandak and another.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.3063 OF 2010

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd., (MSEDCL)

Vs.

Rajkumar Sohanlal Bilala and another.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S. V. Purohit, Advocate for petitioner in all petitions.

Shri S. V. Sirpurkar, Advocate for respondent no.1 in all petitions.

CORAM : AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.

DATE : FEBRUARY 03, 2020.

These petitions were admitted for considering a common issue involved in these writ petitions, i.e., whether infrastructure cost, which was earlier levied for the purpose

(2) 201.Wps.3059,3060,3061,3062,3063.10

of giving electricity connections by the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (M.S.E.D.C.L.), was permissible.

It is stated that the issue was a subject matter in Civil Appeal No.4305/2007 (Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd....Versus...Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission and another) before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, which has been decided on 10/11/2016, by which the imposition of infrastructure cost has been quashed.

In that light of the matter, learned Counsel for the petitioner makes a statement that the M.S.E.D.C.L. has started to refund the infrastructure cost, as received by them, while granting applications, seeking electricity connections.

Learned Counsel for the respondent no.1 makes a statement that the infrastructure cost, as paid by his clients in all these petitions, has been received back, and therefore, the grievance in the matter does not survive.

Statements are accepted and recorded.

In that light of the matter, nothing survives in these writ petitions. The writ petitions are disposed of accordingly. Rule stands discharged. No order as to costs.

JUDGE