

OD- 1

ORDER SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
ORIGINAL SIDE

WPO/215/2025

SABIR HUSSAIN
VS
CALCUTTA ELECTRIC SUPPLY CORPORATION
LIMITED AND ORS.

BEFORE:
The Hon'ble JUSTICE KAUSIK CHANDA
Date: 7th May, 2025

Appearance:
Mr. Arif Ali, Adv.
Mr. Yusuf Ali Mirza, Adv.
Mr. Sarban Bhattacharjee, Adv.
...for the petitioner

Ms. Sreemayee Mitra, Adv.
...for CESC Ltd.

Mr. Shahan Shah, Adv.
Sk. Abumusa, Adv.
...for the respondent no. 4

The Court: The petitioner seeks an electricity connection for his shop-room. It is undisputed that the petitioner is a tenant under respondent no.4, and his settled possession of the shop-room is also not in dispute. However, respondent no.4 contends that the petitioner has been operating his business in the shop-room, which has led to two prior fire incidents.

The petitioner's counsel, however, asserts that the petitioner holds a valid fire license issued by the competent authority.

In light of the uncontested fact that the petitioner has settled possession of the shop-room as a tenant of respondent no.4, I am of the opinion that the petitioner is entitled to a separate electricity connection.

The learned counsel for CESC Limited, however, submits that the connection has not been provided due to obstruction from respondent no.4, as the meter board is inaccessible.

In view of the foregoing, I hereby dispose of this writ petition by directing CESC Limited to provide the requested electricity connection at the petitioner's premises, utilizing the existing meter board and installing a loop meter within three weeks from the date of this order, subject to the petitioner's compliance with all necessary formalities.

The Officer-in-Charge of Gardenreach Police Station is directed to provide necessary assistance to CESC officials in implementing this order, at the petitioner's cost. Should it be necessary, the police may break open the padlock.

It is clarified that the provision of this electricity connection does not confer any equitable rights upon the petitioner and will not affect the pending civil suit between the petitioner and respondent no.4.

(KAUSIK CHANDA, J.)