

18.03.2025
Sl. No.39
akd

W. P. A. 28428 of 2024

[Bhaba Ranjan Das -Vs- The West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. & Ors.]

Mr. Poulami Dutta
Mr. Gouranga Kumar Das
... .. for the petitioner

Mr. Saikat Mondal
Mr. Debdattya Karmakar
... for respondent nos.7 to 11

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

Mr. Amit Prakash Lahiri
Mr. Chandan Kumar Mandal
... .. for the State

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in court today be kept with the record.
2. Petitioner is aggrieved by the non-implementation of the order dated 19.09.2023 passed by the Ombudsman whereby he had directed the respondent-WBSEDCL to erect PCC poles by the side of the road where the previous poles were standing. Ombudsman in its order observed that the licensee had every right to cut the branches of the trees causing disturbance to give supply to the consumers. Accordingly, the licensee was directed to take necessary steps for cutting the branches of the tree which was causing disturbance in the process of carrying out the installation work.
3. It is the case of the Petitioner herein that he is a consumer and had lost his electricity connection due to 'Amphan' disaster. He has preferred the present writ petition wherein he is seeking a direction for erection of a particular pole

from which electricity connection should be drawn to his premises.

4. Learned Counsel for the respondent-WBSEDCL at the outset itself submits that they had already restored the electricity connection of the Petitioner, through an alternative mode and as on today, the Petitioner is enjoying electricity connection.

5. This court finds the argument advanced by the Petitioner is devoid of any merit. The intention of the Ombudsman was to restore the electricity connection of the Petitioner. In the said process, if the respondent requires to cut the branches of any tree, Ombudsman allowed them to do it. However, the respondent-WBSEDCL found an alternative mode to restore the electricity connection of the Petitioner. Petitioner is already enjoying electricity connection. It is not the petitioner's concern as to how the electricity connection is provided to his premises.

6. In view of the submission made by the learned Advocate for the respondent-WBSEDCL that the petitioner is enjoying the electricity connection, this court is of the opinion that no further direction is required.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

8. There shall be no order as to costs.

9. Let urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)