

Sl. No.17
16.04.2025
Suman
Ct. 15

WPA 3596 of 2025

Prakash Kumar Pal
Vs.
The West Bengal State Electricity
Distribution Company Limited and Ors.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee
Ms. Sumana Mukherjee
..,for the petitioner

Dr. Madhusudan Saha Roy
..for WBSEDCL

Mr. Niladri Sekhar Ghosh
Ms. Laboni Sikder
..for respondent nos. 6 and 7.

The petitioner objects to the installation of a high-tension underground cable line intended to supply electricity to the premises developed by Respondent Nos. 6 and 7. The petitioner contends that the underground cable line has been laid across a plot of land owned by him.

The West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Limited has submitted a report, which is placed on record. A copy of the report has already been served upon the parties involved. The relevant portion of the report is quoted below:

“J. The site was again visited by the u/s on 15.03.2025 as per the guideline of Hon’ble High Court Calcutta served on 10.03.2025 and found that the high tension line was drawn through underground system (UG 11KV) and for this kind of system there is no harm or danger for any kind of living beings (photographs enclosed). And there is no violation made during executing such service connection works for respondent no.06 (Sri Aloke Dutta). And it was also observed that the underground (11 KV UG) line was not drawn within any part of the land owned of the petitioner (Sri Prakash Pal) it was also certified by local municipality (copy enclosed), the line has fully drawn through underground means (UG system) maintaining all safety measures as per Electricity Act 2003, and also within the measured land of the respondent no.06 (Sri Aloke Kr. Dutta). Thus this objection made by the petitioner is not valid.”

Respondent Nos. 6 and 7, in contrast, deny the allegations raised by the petitioner. They assert that the land of the petitioner was not utilized for the laying of the underground cable line. Rather, the cable line was drawn through a common passage.

This Court is not in a position to resolve the issue of whether the underground cable line was indeed laid across the petitioner’s land. Such a determination can only be effectively made by a competent civil court or the concerned Grievance Redressal Officer.

In light of this, I am not inclined to entertain this writ petition. However, this order does not preclude the petitioner from seeking redress before a competent civil court or the concerned Grievance Redressal Officer.

Accordingly, **WPA 3596 of 2025** is hereby disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the learned advocates for the parties on usual undertakings.

(Kausik Chanda, J.)