

17
17.01.2025
Court No.14
BP/AGM

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 23048 of 2024

MikkyMegha Hospital Private Limited & Anr.
Vs.
The West Bengal State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited & Ors.

Mr. Subir Banerjee.
Mr. Biswajit Nag.
... for the Petitioners.

Mr. Dr. Madhusudan Saha Ray
... for WBSEDCL.

1. The petitioners are aggrieved by the electricity bills raised by WBSEDCL.
2. It appears that being aggrieved by the meter readings, the petitioners approached the WBSEDCL and one challenge meter was installed to check as to whether the meter readings were correctly recorded or not.
3. By a communication dated 26th March, 2021 the petitioners were informed that the meter reading was OK and there were outstanding dues lying in respect of the said consumer.
4. Being dissatisfied, the petitioners filed representation before the Station Manager and the Assistant Engineer.
5. As there was no positive response from the end of the authority, the petitioners approached the

Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Uttar Dinajpur which rejected the claim of the petitioners by passing an order on 18th August, 2023 which was carried in appeal by the petitioners before the appellate forum being the State Commission and the State Commission also dismissed the appeal filed by the petitioners on 30th August, 2024.

6. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioners alleging that the respondent authorities did not perform duty in terms of the statutory provision.
7. Prayer has been made to restrain the licensee company from disconnecting the electric supply of the petitioners.
8. Learned counsel representing WBSEDCL submits that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed with exemplary costs. The petitioners, only with the view of not making payment in terms of the bill that has been raised, is moving from one forum to the other.
9. It has been submitted that as the petitioners have already approached the forum under the Consumer Protection Act, 2019, the petitioners have the statutory remedy of appeal before the National Commission.
10. I have heard the submission made on behalf of both the parties and perused the materials on record. It appears that being dissatisfied with the bills raised by the Company, the petitioners

approached the district consumer forum and thereafter the State Commission. The petitioners never approached the Grievance Redressal Officer under Regulation 56.

11. At this stage, it is not possible for the writ Court to revisit or reopen the issue all over again. It will be open for the petitioners to approach the competent forum for remedy.

12. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

13. Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance of usual legal formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)