



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 11.11.2022

DELIVERED ON : 15.11.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

W.P.No.18930 of 2017

Sri Mahalakshmi Plastics
Rep. by its Partner,
V.Gunasekaran,
No.9, 2nd Cross, Bharathi Street,
Ellapillai Chavadi,
Puducherry - 605 005.

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Puducherry Industrial Promotion Development
and Investment Corporation Limited (PIPDIC),
Rep. by its Managing Director,
No.60, Romain Rollant Street,
Puducherry - 605 001.

2. The Superintending Engineer - III,
Electricity Department,
Puducherry.

3. The Executive Engineer IV
Electricity Department,
Puducherry.

4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Sedarapet, Puducherry.

.. Respondents



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

Prayer: Writ Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 2 to 4 to effect new power supply to the petitioner's industry at the Industrial Plot allotted in No.B-57, measuring 648 Sq.M. comprised in R.S.No.37/2 (Part) and R.S.No.37/4 (Part) at PIPDIC Industrial Estate, Sedarapet Revenue Village, Puducherry without reference to any alleged arrears of the erstwhile allottee of the said industrial plot.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Saikrishnan

For Respondent 1 : Mr.D.Ravichander

For Respondents 2 to 4 : Mrs.V.Usha
AGP (Pondy)

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a Mandamus directing the Respondents 2 to 4 to effect new power supply to the petitioner's industry at the Industrial Plot allotted in No.B-57, measuring an extent of 648 Sq.M., comprised in R.S.No.37/2 (Part) and R.S.No.37/4 (Part) at PIPDIC Industrial Estate, Sedarapet Revenue Village, Puducherry without reference to any alleged arrears of the erstwhile allottee of the said industrial plot.

2. It is the case of the writ petitioner that petitioner firm was allotted the



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

industrial Plot bearing No.B-57, measuring an extent of 648 Sq.M. in R.S.No.37/2(Part) and R.S.No.37/4(Part) at PIPDIC Industrial Estate, Sedarapet, Puducherry on lease basis. A lease deed was executed by the first respondent on 02.05.2016, in favour of the Petitioner granting long time lease for a period of 99 years. The said document has been registered at the Office of the Sub-Registrar, Villianur.

3. The petitioner has also paid a sum of Rs.2,91,600/- by way of premium to the first respondent and has also been regularly paying the rent. He has also paid a sum of Rs.7,51,455/- to the first respondent towards the cost of the superstructure that was existing in the said property. The property was handed over to the petitioner in May, 2017.

4. The petitioner has made an application for availing power supply for its unit to the fourth respondent. The fourth respondent orally informed the petitioner that power supply cannot be granted to the plot allotted to the petitioner by the first respondent due to the fact that the erstwhile allottee, one Sri Vetrivelan Enterprises were in arrears of huge amounts to the Electricity Department and unless such amounts are paid by the petitioner that they will



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

not be in a position to effect power supply to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

5. It is the contention of the writ petitioner that the first respondent did not put the petitioner on notice about the said alleged arrears of the electricity charges left by the erstwhile allottee at the time when the allotment was made to the petitioner to till date. The first respondent has allotted the land together with the building free of any charges or claims so that the petitioner could commence its industrial activities in the said industrial plot and it is only based on the representation made by the first respondent that the industrial plot came to be taken on lease by the petitioner for running its manufacturing unit by paying huge premium and also paying the cost towards the superstructure to the first respondent.

6. The petitioner has also obtained all the requisite licenses and permissions under the various authorities like the Inspector of Factories, Puducherry, Pollution Control Committee and the local bodies. When the petitioner has made all the necessary arrangements for commencing the industrial activities by making huge investments, the petitioner is put to great shock due to the refusal by the Respondents 2 to 4 to grant power supply to



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking the aforesaid direction.

7. Counter affidavit has been filed by the third respondent and adopted by the second and fourth respondents. It is their contention that Plot No B-57 at the PIPDIC Industrial Estate at Sedharapet, Puducherry, was originally allotted to M/s.Sri Vetrivelan Products. The above electricity service connections were effected on 23.05.2003, based on Lease Deed executed on 31.10.1994, between the General Manager Development of PIPDIC and the partners of M/s Sri Vetrivelan Products for a period of 99 years. Both the above service connections had been disconnected on April 2014 for non-payment of Current Consumption Charges. The outstanding dues as on September 2017, in respect of those service connections in Policy Code No.36-66-02-0142/A1 and Policy Code No.36-66-02-0143/C1 are Rs.14,334/- and Rs.26,83,005/- respectively totaling a sum of Rs.26,97,339/-.

8. It is their further contention that the erstwhile occupant of the premises has outstanding dues towards CC charges accrued to the Electricity Department to the tune of Rs.27 lakhs. The Electricity Department is ready to extend power supply to the petitioner firm subject to submission of prescribed



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

application form along with the required documents as mandated under the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission Regulations and payment of outstanding current consumption charges, etc., over the said premises accrued to the Exchequer.

9. As per the terms of the covenants to the lease deed executed by the lessor, PIPDIC, the first respondent herein and the erstwhile allottee, M/s. Sri Vetrivelan Products it is mutually agreed by the parties as per Clause 18(i) of the lease deed that the party of the second part i.e M/s.Sri Vetrivelan Products shall pay all the existing and future rates and taxes, charges, claims, assessment and outgoing of every description, chargeable against the owner or occupier in respect of the allotted plot and any building erected thereon.

10. Further, in terms of the conditions attached to the allotment order F- PIPDIC/Dev/282/91/232/B-2027/4017, dated 09.09.2014 issued by the first Respondent (PIPDIC) to the petitioner firm stipulates that the allottee shall pay all the existing and future rates and taxes, charges, claims assessment and outgoing of the every description, chargeable against the owner or occupier in respect of the allotted plot and any building erected thereon.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

WEB COPY 11. It is their further contention that the lessor of the premises (PIPDIC)

before re-allotting the industrial premises to the petitioner has not informed to the Electricity Department, Puducherry. The owner/occupier of the premises was obliged by the mandatory provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003 and required to abide by the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (JERC). The Tariff Order issued by the JERC is statutory in force and as such binding on the owner/occupier of the premises. Hence supply of electricity to the premises cannot be made unless the outstanding dues are cleared.

12. It is further stated that in the Tariff Order dated 16.05.2017, Clause 9.3. deals with General Terms and Conditions, which states that the Tariff indicated in the tariff schedule is the tariff rate payable by the consumers of Union Territory of Pondicherry and these Tariffs are exclusive of electricity duty, taxes and other charges levied by the Government or other competent authorities from time to time.

13. According to the respondents 2 to 4 the Tariff Order issued by the JERC, dues have to be paid by the new owner/occupant before supply can be



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

continued/restored. It is the duty of the owner/occupier at the premises to

himself make enquiries and find out whether there was such dues or not. The

General Conditions of supply are statutory in nature being delegated legislation and hence the question of bona fide or mala fide does not arise, and in either case, the new owner/occupant of the premises has to pay the dues against the previous owner/tenant, if he wishes the electric supply to be continued/restored.

14. It is further contended that if the arrears of electricity charges outstanding in respect of electricity supplied to a premises were to be permitted to be equated with a contractual claims of damages, it would encourage dishonest consumers to raise some dispute or other in respect of such arrears and evade the consequences of non-payment of electricity charges viz. disconnection/non-resumption of supply. Further, due to default in payment of outstanding dues towards current consumption charges, etc. by the owner/occupant of the premises, followed by subsequent selling/transferring the property, the Electricity Department would not be in a position to recover the dues thereby resulting in heavy financial loss to the State Exchequer. Hence the respondents 2 to 4 seek dismissal of the writ petition.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

WEB COPY **15.** The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that while allotting the property to the petitioner by the first respondent, the electricity dues has not been intimated to the petitioner. If the same has been intimated to the petitioner, then he would not have ventured to take the premises on lease. Therefore, in the absence of any notice about the existing dues, the petitioner cannot be clothed with the liability of arrears by erstwhile occupant.

16. It is further contended by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that as per Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 recovery of any arrears has to be made within a period of two years, whereas in this case the alleged disconnection has been made in the year 2014, whereas, re-allotment has been made by the first respondent to the petitioner only in the year 2017. Therefore, it is contended that when the period for recovery itself is lost, the respondents 2 to 4 now cannot refuse to give new electricity service connection to the petitioner.

17. Merely because there is a condition in the contract that the allottee



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

has to take the possession of the developed plot in "as is where is" conditions, it cannot be presumed that arrears electricity charges is also included in the terms of condition. Hence, the learned counsel submitted that the petitioner is entitled to electricity service connection and seeks direction to the respondents 2 to 4 to provide electricity service connection. In support of his above submissions he relied upon the following judgments:

- (i) *Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited Vs. Gopal Agarwal*** reported in **(2018) 12 SCC 644** and
- (ii) *Special Officer, Commerce, North Eastern Electricity Supply Company of Orissa (NESCO) Vs. Raghunath Paper Mills Private Limited*** reported in **(2012) 13 SCC 479**.

18. Whereas, the learned Additional Government Pleader (Pondy) appearing for the respondents 2 to 4 would submit that as per Clause 13 of the allotment conditions, the allottee shall take possession of the developed plot in "as is where is" conditions and no more further developments such as earth filling, raising the level, etc., shall be entertained and other improvement of developments inside the allotted plot is purely the responsibility to the allottee concerned.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

WEB COPY **19.** It is also her contention that Clause 20 of the allotment order makes it very clear that allottee shall pay all existing and future rates and taxes, charges, claims assessment and outgoings of every description, chargeable against the owner or occupier in respect of the allotted site and any building erected thereon.

20. Further the learned Additional Government Pleader (Pondy) contended that as per the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (JERC) (for the State of Goa and Union Territories) Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2018 it is the duty of the applicant to verify the dues to the Electricity Board by the previous owner and obtain a no due certificate, but whereas, the petitioner has not obtained no due certificate and according to the learned Additional Government Pleader (Pondy), the charges towards Electricity Department is a statutory charge and hence submitted that electricity service connection cannot be given unless the due amount has been paid. In support of her submissions, the learned counsel relied upon the following Hon'ble Apex Court judgment:

(i) *Assistant Engineer (D1), Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited Vs.*



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

Rahamatullah Khan alias Rahamjulla in C.A.No.1672 of 2020 dated

18.02.2020 and

(ii) Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited

Vs. M/s.Srigdhaa Beverages in C.A.No.1815 of 2020 dated 01.06.2020.

21. I have heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and also perused the entire materials available on record carefully.

22. It is not in dispute that the petitioner has been allotted an industrial plot by the first respondent on 09.09.2014. Clauses 13 and 20 of the conditions provisionally prescribed for allotment of plot in PIPDIC Industrial Estate on premium lease is as follows:

"Clause 13. The allottee will take possession of the developed plot in "as is where is" conditions and no more further developments such as earth filling, raising the level, etc., shall be entertained and other improvement of developments inside the allotted plot is purely the responsibility to the allottee concerned."

Clause 20. The allottee shall pay all existing and future rates and taxes, charges, claims



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

assessment and outgoings of every description, chargeable against the owner or occupier in respect of the allotted site and any building erected thereon."

23. Though the condition stipulates that the plot is allotted in "as is where is" condition, no where it is mentioned what are the nature of arrears payable towards the electricity connection.

24. In the Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission (JERC) (for the State of Goa and Union Territories) Electricity Supply Code Regulations, 2018 Clause 5 deals with the procedure for release of new connection and modification in existing connection. Regulations 5.1, 5.18, 5.19, 5.20 and 5.21 reads as follows:

"Regulation 5.1 The licensee shall, on an application by the owner or occupier of any premises located in his area of supply, give supply of electricity to such premises within the time specified in this code, 2018 provided that

(1) The supply of power is technically feasible. Where it is found to be not feasible, the licensee shall endeavor to improve the feasibility at the earliest and release connection as per this Supply Code. 2018.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

(2) *The applicant has observed the procedure specified in this Supply Code, 2018; and*

(3) *The applicant agrees to bear the cost of supply and services as specified in this Supply Code, 2018.*

Regulation 5.18 *The licensee shall prominently display on its website and wherever feasible, in its offices, the updated status of applications for new connections in that area/circle, detailed procedure for grant of new connection and the complete list of documents required to be furnished along with such applications. Normally no document, which has not been so listed, will be required for processing application forms for new connection. Security amount and cost of service line to be deposited by applicant in accordance with Annexure- XVIII to this Supply Code, 2018 shall also be prominently displayed.*

Regulation 5.19 *Connection to any applicant residing in unauthorized colonies/areas or disputed property shall not be granted where a restraining/prohibition order has been issued by*



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

any Indian court and a restraining/prohibition order has been issued by any competent authority.

Regulation 5.20 Where the applicant has purchased an existing property whose electricity connection has been disconnected, it shall be the applicant's duty to verify that the previous owner has paid all dues to the licensee and obtained a "no-dues certificate" from him. In case where "no-dues certificate" has not been obtained by the previous owner before change in ownership of property, the new owner may approach the licensee for such a certificate. The licensee shall acknowledge receipt of such request and shall either intimate in writing the dues outstanding on the premises, if any, or issue a "no-dues certificate" within 1 month from date of receipt of such application.

Regulation 5.21 In case the licensee does not intimate the outstanding dues or issue a "no dues certificate" within this time, new connection to the premises shall not be denied on grounds of outstanding dues of the previous consumer. In such an event, the licensee shall have to recover the dues if any, from previous consumer as per



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

provisions of law."

WEB COPY

25. Regulation 5.20 makes it clear that where the applicant has purchased an existing property whose electricity connection has been disconnected, the new applicant or the purchaser has to verify whether the previous owner has paid all the dues to the licensee and obtained “no-dues certificate” from him. In cases where “no-dues certificate” has not been obtained by the previous owner before change in ownership of property, the new owner may approach the licensee for such a certificate. The licensee shall acknowledge receipt of such request and shall either intimate in writing the dues outstanding on the premises, if any, or issue a “no-dues certificate” within one month from date of receipt of such application.

26. Regulation 5.21 makes it clear that such licensee does not intimate the outstanding dues or issue a “no dues certificate” within this time, new connection to the premises shall not be denied on grounds of outstanding dues of the previous consumer. In such an event, the Licensee shall have to recover the dues if any, from previous consumer as per provisions of law.

27. Therefore, the above Regulations make it very clear that the



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

applicant/purchaser has to verify the outstanding due and obtain a “no-dues certificate”. It is the duty of the licensee to indicate the outstanding dues within a month. In the event of the failure on the part of the licensee to indicate the dues within a month, then connection cannot be denied on the ground of outstanding dues of the previous consumer. It is admitted in the counter affidavit filed by the respondents 2 to 4 that the petitioner has addressed a letter dated 23.07.2017, however, on record there is no material to show that dues have been intimated to the petitioner in writing.

28. Be that as it may, though Regulation 5.88(4) makes it clear that any charge for electricity or any sum other than charge for electricity as due and payable to licensee, which remains unpaid by a deemed consumer or the erstwhile owner / occupier of any land/premises as the case may be, shall be a charge on the premises transmitted to the legal representative / successors-in-law or transferred to the new owner of the premise as the case may be, and the same shall be recoverable by the licensee as due from such legal representative or successor-in-law or new owner/occupier of the premises as the case may be.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

29. But the fact remains that though it is charged when new connection is sought to be obtained, it is the duty of the licensee to indicate the outstanding dues as per Regulation 5.20, which has not been done in this case, whereas Regulation 5.21 makes it mandatory on the part of the licensee to provide connection if the outstanding amount has not been intimated within one month. The petitioner has filed an application for connection and after receipt of that application; the dues have not been intimated in writing to the petitioner within the stipulated period. Therefore, now the licensee cannot contend that merely because charge has been created, the same should be enforced on the subsequent purchaser.

30. Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 reads as follows:

“Section 56(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in any other law for the time being in force, no sum due from any consumer, under this section shall be recoverable after the period of two years from the date when such sum became first due unless such sum has been shown continuously as recoverable as arrear of charges for electricity supplied and the licensee shall not cut off the supply of the electricity.”



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

31. In this regard, the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Assistant Engineer (D1), Ajmer Vidyut Vitran Nigam Limited Vs. Rahamatullah Khan alias Rahamjulla* in *C.A.No.1672 of 2020* dated *18.02.2020* has held in paragraphs 7.2, 7.3, 7.4 and 8 has as follows:

“7.2 In Swastic Industries v. Maharashtra State Electricity Board, this Court while interpreting Section 24 of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 held that : –

“5. It would, thus, be clear that the right to recover the charges is one part of it and right to discontinue supply of electrical energy to the consumer who neglects to pay charges is another part of it.”
(emphasis supplied)

7.3 Sub-section (1) of Section 56 confers a statutory right to the licensee company to disconnect the supply of electricity, if the consumer neglects to pay the electricity dues.

This statutory right is subject to the period of limitation of two years provided by sub-section (2) of Section 56 of the Act.

7.4 The period of limitation of two years



would commence from the date on which the electricity charges became “first due” under sub-section (2) of Section 56. This provision restricts the right of the licensee company to disconnect electricity supply due to non-payment of dues by the consumer, unless such sum has been shown continuously to be recoverable as arrears of electricity supplied, in the bills raised for the past period.

If the licensee company were to be allowed to disconnect electricity supply after the expiry of the limitation period of two years after the sum became “first due”, it would defeat the object of Section 56(2).

8. Section 56(2) however, does not preclude the licensee company from raising a supplementary demand after the expiry of the limitation period of two years. It only restricts the right of the licensee to disconnect electricity supply due to non-payment of dues after the period of limitation of two years has expired, nor does it restrict other modes of recovery which may be initiated by the licensee company for recovery of a supplementary demand.”



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

WEB COPY **32.** But in the instant case there is no material whatsoever to show whether the arrears by the previous owner has been continuously shown as recoverable as arrears and whether disconnection was made after expiry of two years or not. No material has been placed before this Court. If the disconnection is made beyond the period of two years, which is against the provisions of Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the above judgment, these particulars have not been placed before this Court.

33. It is also relevant to note that the electricity connection to the erstwhile allottee was disconnected in the month of April, 2014 whereas, no material has been shown that charges payable by the erstwhile owner was continuously shown as arrears. The new electricity connection was sought by the petitioner only in the year 2017 and no steps have been taken to recover the amount within a period of two years as mandated under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. Taking into consideration all the above and even the Regulations itself mandates such connection with existing arrears if the due of arrears is not indicated within one month as per Regulation 5.21, the petitioner



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

is certainly entitled to new connection.

WEB COPY

34. In another judgment in ***Telangana State Southern Power Distribution Company Limited Vs. M/s.Srigdhaa Beverages*** in ***C.A.No.1815 of 2020*** dated ***01.06.2020*** the Hon'ble Apex Court has held in paragraph 15 as follows:

“15. We have gone into the aforesaid judgments as it was urged before us that there is some ambiguity on the aspect of liability of dues of the past owners who had obtained the connection. There have been some differences in facts but, in our view, there is a clear judicial thinking which emerges, which needs to be emphasized:

A. That electricity dues, where they are statutory in character under the Electricity Act and as per the terms & conditions of supply, cannot be waived in view of the provisions of the Act itself more specifically Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (in pari materia with Section 24 of the Electricity Act, 1910), and cannot partake the character of dues of purely contractual nature.

B. Where, as in cases of the E-auction notice



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

in question, the existence of electricity dues, whether quantified or not, has been specifically mentioned as a liability of the purchaser and the sale is on "AS IS WHERE IS, WHATEVER THERE IS AND WITHOUT RECOURSE BASIS", there can be no doubt that the liability to pay electricity dues exists on the respondent (purchaser).

C. The debate over connection or reconnection would not exist in cases like the present one where both aspects are covered as per clause 8.4 of the General Terms & Conditions of Supply."

35. Though the allotment is made in "as is where is condition" the existence of electricity dues whether quantified or not has not been specifically mentioned in the conditions. Therefore, in the absence of notice about the existence of electricity dues, the petitioner cannot be clothed with the liability merely on the ground that the property was allotted on the basis of "as is where is" condition.

36. The Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Southern Power Distribution Company of Telangana Limited Vs. Gopal Agarwal*** reported in (2018) 12



SCC 644 in paragraphs 6 and 7 has held as follows:

WEB COPY

“6. We have heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties and we are of the opinion that there is no reason to interfere with the judgment of the High Court. The High Court relied upon the judgment in Isha Marbles(supra) to grant relief to the First Respondent. It was held in the said judgment that an auction purchaser cannot be called upon to clear the past arrears. It was also held that a power connection to an auction purchaser cannot be withheld for the dues of the past owner. The High Court also referred to a judgment in Ahmedabad Electricity Company Limited(supra) wherein the ratio of the judgment in Isha Marbles case was reiterated, particularly with reference to a fresh connection for supply of electricity. In NESCO v. Raghunath Paper Mills (P) Ltd., (2012) 13 SCC 479, the purchaser in an auction sale conducted by the official liquidator on “as is where is” and “whatever there is” basis was found not liable for payment of the electricity arrears. In the said case an advertisement was issued by the official liquidator for sale of moveable and immoveable property of M/s Konark Paper and Industries Limited on “as is where is” and whatever there is” basis. The auction purchaser applied for a



fresh electricity connection to its unit which was denied on the ground of non payment of arrears by the past owner. After considering the judgments in Ahmedabad Electricity Company (supra) and Isha Marbles (supra), this Court held that the request of the auction purchaser for a fresh connection could not have been rejected.

7. The facts of this case are similar to that of NESCO v. Raghunath Paper Mills (P) Ltd., (2012) 13 SCC 479. The tender/sale notice mentioned that the property was being auctioned on “as is where is” basis. The First Respondent applied for a fresh connection and he is in no way connected to the past owner. He has also not undertaken to pay the past arrears of the previous owner. In view of the above, the Appeal is dismissed.”

37. Similarly, the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Special Officer, Commerce, North Eastern Electricity Supply Company of Orissa (NESCO) Vs. Raghunath Paper Mills Private Limited* reported in (2012) 13 SCC 479 in paragraph 14 has held as follows:

“14. We were also taken through the other regulations, viz., Regulation Nos. 3 and 10 and various Forms which would show the words “other



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

dues including the security as may be payable” does not mean and were not meant to convey that a new applicant for fresh connection shall pay arrears of electricity dues or other dues for the same premises “payable by the earlier consumer” as stated in Regulation 10.

15) As rightly pointed out by Mr. P.P. Rao, learned senior counsel for respondent No. 1, the absence of these words in para 3 conclusively shows that the term “other dues” refers to security and other charges payable for a new connection in terms of the conditions of supply but not the arrears of electricity dues payable by earlier consumer who was in default.”

38. Even in Condition No.20 in the allotment order dated 09.09.2014, there is no whisper about any electricity dues, therefore, in the absence of any specific mention about the electricity dues, it cannot be said that those conditions were only in respect of electricity dues and payable by the subsequent purchasers.

39. Considering the above aspects and the further fact that the petitioner has in fact requested for connection in the year 2017 itself and even after such



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

application, the respondents 2 to 4 have not intimated the dues within one month to the petitioner as per Regulation 5.20. Therefore, it is mandatory on the part of the respondents 2 to 4 to provide electricity connection to the petitioner as per Regulation 5.21 of the JERC Regulations, 2018.

40. Such view of the matter, this writ petition is allowed and the respondents 2 to 4 are directed to provide electricity connection to the petitioner within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order without insisting the dues payable by the erstwhile allottee. Further, the respondents 2 to 4 are at liberty to recover the said dues from the erstwhile allottee as per law. No costs.

15.11.2022

Index : Yes / No

kk

To

1. The Managing Director,
Puducherry Industrial Promotion Development
and Investment Corporation Limited (PIDIC),
No.60, Romain Rollant Street,
Puducherry - 605 001.
2. The Superintending Engineer - III,
Electricity Department,
Puducherry.



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

3. The Executive Engineer IV
Electricity Department,
Puducherry.

4. The Assistant Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Sedarapet, Puducherry



WEB COPY



W.P.No.18930 of 2017

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

kk

PRE-DELIVERY ORDER
in W.P.No.18930 of 2017

RESERVED ON : 11.11.2022

DELIVERED ON : 15.11.2022