

17th May,
2023
(AK)
10

W.P.A 11518 of 2023

Nimai Das
Vs.
The State of West Bengal and others

Mr. Syed Shamsul Arefin
Ms. Nadira Abedin
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Sujit Sankar Koley
...for the WBSEDCL.

Mr. Himadri Sikhar Chakraborty
Ms. Susnita Saha
...for the State.

Affidavit-of-service filed in court today be kept on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bill sent to the petitioner in lieu of electricity charges was inflated.

That apart, a meter was required to be installed for the purpose of giving electricity supply to the petitioner which was not done by the WBSEDCL.

However, learned counsel for the WBSEDCL points out that in the meantime the meter has been properly installed for the purpose of giving electricity supply to the petitioner.

Insofar as the billing dispute is concerned, it is argued that the same is required to be adjudicated by the Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) concerned.

There is substance in the arguments of the WBSEDCL.

WPA 11518 of 2023 is, thus, disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the concerned GRO with the billing dispute as raised in the present writ petition.

If so approached, the GRO shall decide the same in accordance with law, upon giving opportunity of hearing to all concerned, preferably within eight weeks from the date of such reference being made.

Further liberty is granted to the petitioner to approach the GRO for reliefs regarding restraint order on the WBSEDCL in respect of disconnection of the supply of the petitioner prior to adjudication of the dispute.

There will be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat copies of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)