

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 14690 OF 2024

Dipali Suryakant Patil

...Petitioner

Versus

Adani Electricity Mumbai Ltd.

...Respondent

Mr. Sandeep Mishra a/w Mr. Prakash Mishra i/by Mr. Vijay Tiwari,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Vignesh Kamat i/by Mr. Satish Kamat, Advocate for the
Respondent.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.**

DATE : 23rd OCTOBER, 2024

PER COURT :-

1. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner tried to camouflage a dispute between the Petitioner and a third party with regards to the location where the electricity connection was sought. He has actually dodged our question by stating that there is no dispute. It was the learned Advocate for the Respondent who has brought to our notice that there is a dispute between the Petitioner and some person and hence, when the Respondent reached the location to lay the service cables, there was a strong objection by the

Digitally signed
by SUNNY
ANKUSHRAO
THOTE
Date:
2024.10.24
15:35:09 +0530

third party. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that he is seeking an electricity connection only to the watchman's room in the said property.

2. Such disputed issues cannot be considered by this Court. There cannot be a *Writ of Mandamus* to a private entity, since the Respondent is not a State under Article 12 of the Constitution.

3. For both the above reasons, **the Writ Petition is dismissed.**

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)