



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3989 OF 2025

Dr. Balkrishan Damodar Patil,
Age : 64 years, Occu : Medical Profession,
R/o : Plot No. 6, Dongargaon Road,
Suvarnanagari, Shahada,
Taluka Shahada,
Dist. Nandurbar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.,
Through the Deputy Executive Engineer,
Shahada Sub-Division, Shahada,
Taluka Shahada,
Dist. Nandurbar

.. Respondent

...
Advocate for the petitioner : Mr. Amit S. Savale
...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
Y. G. KHOBRADE, JJ.**

DATE : 25 MARCH 2025

ORDER (MANGESH S. PATIL, J.) :

Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner is coming with following prayer :

(B) By issuing Writ of Quo-warranto or any other appropriate Writ, Order of direction in the nature of Writ, the impugned notices dated 25/02/2025 (Annexure C) & 13/03/2025 (Annexure E) issued by the respondent and the further actions taken in pursuance of the same may kindly be quashed and set aside.

3. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the entire property is owned by the petitioner. On the ground floor, the petitioner runs his hospital and has fetched electricity connection with a specific consumer number. The first floor was leased out to a blood bank. A separate electricity meter and a different consumer number was obtained from the respondent – Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. The tenant did not clear the electricity charges and the liability is now being fastened on to the petitioner after the tenant vacated it. He has been issued with impugned notices dated 25.02.2025 and 13.03.2025 and is threatened with a coercive action of snapping of electricity connection.

4. Though the petitioner is raising a dispute about liability to pay the electricity bill, he has already resorted to a statutory remedy under section 42(5) to 42(7) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commissioner (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulation, 2020. In our considered view, he cannot be allowed to simultaneously resort to two remedies for the same relief.

5. Granting liberty to the petitioner to pursue the remedy before the Grievance Redressal Forum, the petition is disposed of.

[Y. G. KHOBRAGADE]
JUDGE

[MANGESH S. PATIL]
JUDGE

arp/