

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19855 of 2016

1. The Chairman, Bihar State Electricity Board
2. The Secretary, Bihar State Electricity Board, Now the General Manager HR Adm Vidyut Bhawan, Bailey
3. The Chief Engineer O and M Bihar State Electricity Board now South Bihar Power Distribution Company
4. The General Manager-cum-Chief Engineer Central Supply Area Bihar State Electricity Board Now Deput
5. The Electrical Superintending Engineer, Bihar State Electricity Board Electric Supply Circle, Bhojp
6. The Executive Engineer, Bihar State Electricity Board, Supply Division, Bhojpur, Arrah.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Smt. Lakshmi Devi and Ors wife of Late Sonu Kumar Rai @ Sonu, son of Sri Narendra Rai, Resident of Village P.O.- Agiayan, P.S.- Agiayan G District Bhojpur, Arrah.
2. The District Magistrate, Arrah Bhojpur.
3. The State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission Bihar, Patna through its Chairman, R.Block Patna.
4. The Chairman, State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Bihar at Patna, R. Block.
5. The Member, State Consumer Disputed Redressal Commission, Bihar, Patna.
6. The Principal Secretary, Energy Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Akhileshwar Singh, Advocate Mr. Vijay Kumar Verma, Advocate Mr. Vinay Kirti Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Abbas Haider, SC-6
For the State	:	Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, AC to SC-6

**CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. G. ANUPAMA
CHAKRAVARTHY**

ORAL ORDER

3 11-11-2024 1. The Writ petition is filed challenging the

orders of State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission

Bihar, Patna in Complaint Case No. 04 of 2012 dated



17.12.2015.

2. Admittedly, an appeal has to be filed against the orders of State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Bihar, Patna before the National Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Delhi. Instead of filing an appeal, the present Writ petition is filed challenging the orders of State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Bihar, Patna.

3. This Court is of the considerable view that the Writ petition itself is not maintainable for challenging the orders of State Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission as an effective alternative remedy is available for the petitioner to prefer an appeal before the National Consumer Dispute Redressal Commission, Delhi.

4. In view of the above observations, the Writ petition is dismissed as it is devoid of merits.

(G. Anupama Chakravarthy, J)

Manishkr/-

U			
---	--	--	--

