

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

WRIT PETITION NO.460 OF 2011

[Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Akola .vs. Shri Anand Agrawal and one]
 with

WRIT PETITION NO.461 OF 2011

[Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Akola .vs. Shri Deepak Agrawal and one]
 with

WRIT PETITION NO.462 OF 2011

[Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Akola .vs. Shri Sanjay Mantri and one]
 with

WRIT PETITION NO.463 OF 2011

[Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Akola .vs. Shri Deepak Manohar Watmare and one]

 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 Alok Daga, Advocate for respondent no.1 in all petitions.

CORAM : N.B. SURYAWANSHI, J.

DATED : AUGUST 09, 2021.

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 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 Company Limited .vs. 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.

(N.B. Suryawanshi, J.)