

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.11602 of 2017

=====

Surendra Prasad son of Late Deo Nandan Prasad Resident of Mohalla
Mohanpur Punaichak, P.S. - Shastrinagar in the Town and District Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited Through Its
Managing Director and Ors
2. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, New Capital
PESUW Sardar Patel Path,
3. The Assistant Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Division, New Capital,
PESUW Sardar Patel Path,
4. The Assistant Electrical Engineer Revenue, Electric Supply Division, New
Capital, PESU W, Sardar
5. The Junior Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Section Board Colony in the
Town and District Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Kumar Pandey, Advocate Mr. Ugranath Mallik, Advocate
For the SBPDC Ltd.	:	Mr. Kumar Priya Ranjan, Advocate Mr. Vibhuti Kumar, Advocate
For respondent No.6	:	Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PURNENDU SINGH
ORAL ORDER

7 17-02-2023 Heard Mr. Rajiv Ranjan Kumar Pandey, learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Kumar Priya
Ranjan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of SBPDC Ltd.,
Mr. Sunil Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the respondent
No.6 and Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, learned counsel for the State.

2. The Counter Affidavit filed on behalf of the
respondent No. 6 is kept on record.

3. The petitioner and respondent No.6 are on inimical



terms. The record reveals that petitioner is residing on Municipal Holding No. 249, whereas the respondent no.6 is having a separate Holding No. 249-B. The dispute has been created by the power holding company by entertaining the application made by the respondent no.6 claiming his title over the Holding No. 249, which is in possession of the petitioner, which has not been disputed as on date at any forum having jurisdiction.

4. It appears that the power holding company has proceeded to decide the title of the petitioner without jurisdiction to reject the claim of the petitioner. Such action is unwarranted.

5. The respondent power holding company is directed to restore the electricity connection of the respective parties.

6. With the above observation, the present writ application is disposed of.

(Purnendu Singh, J)

manish/-

U			
---	--	--	--

