# IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No.2680 of 2025**

**In**

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.8139 of 2025**

**CNR No. BRHC010782872025**

==========

Vikash Kumar Son of Ramswaroop Yadav Resident of Village- Sonu Bigha, P.S.- Bodh Gaya, District- Gaya.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited, through its Managing Director Mr. Mahendra Kumar, Vidhyut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. Mr. Sanjay Kumar Berio, The Electrical Superintendent Engineer, Electric Supply Anchal, Gaya.
3. Mr. Prem Kumar Praveen, The The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Gaya (Urban).
4. Samar Kumar, The Assistant Electric Engineer, Electric Supply Sub-Division, Bodh Gaya.
5. Rishabh Ranjan, The Junior Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Sub-Division, Bodh Gaya (Urban).

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

with

**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8139 of 2025**

**CNR No. BRHC010782872025**

==========

Vikash Kumar son of Ramswaroop Yadav, Resident of Village-Sonu Bigha, P.S.-Bodh Gaya, District-Gaya.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The South Bihar Power Distribution Company Limited through its Managing Director, Vidhut Bhawan, Bailey Road, Patna.
2. The Electrical Superintendent Engineer, Electric Supply Anchal, Gaya.
3. The Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Gaya (Urban).
4. The Assistant Electric Engineer, Electric Supply Sub-Division, Bodh Gaya.
5. The Junior Electrical Engineer, Electric Supply Sub-Division, Bodh Gaya (Urban).

... ... Respondent/s

==========

**Appearance :**
(In Miscellaneous Jurisdiction Case No. 2680 of 2025)

WEB COPY

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : None
(In Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No. 8139 of 2025)
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : None

==========

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY**

ORAL ORDER

12 27-10-2026 This **MJC No. 2680 of 2025** arises out of pending writ petition *viz* **CWJC No. 8139 of 2025** and the petitioner alleged that the interim order has been violated. In the aforesaid background, this Court deems it appropriate to first take up the writ petition which is tagged with the contempt petition.

**CWJC No. 8139 of 2025**

2. Heard Mr. Ashok Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner in both the cases. There is no representation on behalf of the respondents.

3. The CWJC No. 8139 of 2025 has been preferred for the following relief(s):

> *"(i) For quashing the notice and demand contained in Memo Number 1028 dated 07.10.2023 issued by Respondent No. 04 whereby and whereunder petitioner has been directed to deposit an amount of Rupees: 3,24,626/- which is said to be due in electric meter of consumer Number 227201274999 in the name of father of the petitioner, inspite of that petitioner's father has not*

WEB COPY

*taken the said connection and the petitioner is using electricity vide Consumer No. 226409097318.*

*(ii) For giving a direction to make an enquiry and produce the evidence regarding consumption of electricity existence of consumer number 227201274999 shown to be existing in the name of father of the petitioner.*

*(iii) For giving a direction to dispose of the representation of the petitioner by reasoned and speaking order within stipulated time.*

*(iv) For giving a direction not to disconnect the electric supply of the petitioner of his new connection of Consumer Number 226409097318 till disposal of the writ petition or disposal of the representation by a reasoned and speaking order.*

*(v) Any other relief /reliefs for which the petitioner is found entitled in the facts and circumstances of the present case."*

4. The petitioner is having a premises within the jurisdiction of Bodh Gaya, Gaya Ji and is aggrieved by the

WEB COPY

decision taken by the respondents asking him to pay Rs. 3,24,626/- pending against **Consumer No. 227201274999** which according to the respondents was earlier running in the name of his father, **Ramswaroop Yadav.**

5. The contention of the petitioner is that he is having a **Consumer No. 226409097318** and there was no such electricity connection in the name of his father, Ram Swaroop Yadav.

6. Earlier, after the disconnection and filing of the writ petition, the Coordinate Bench directed the respondents to restore the supply of electricity to the petitioner subject to payment of half of the amount (Rs. 1,62,313/-). This order dated 15.05.2025 according to the petitioner was complied on 17.05.2025 whereafter the electricity was restored.

7. Subsequently, MJC No. 2680 of 2025 was filed, alleging that the respondents have violated the order by demanding the remaining amount and that the electricity supply was being disconnected intermittently.

8. Upon query, why the statement made in the show cause that a consumer number was running in the name of Ramswaroop Yadav has not been rebutted, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the shops had been let out to tenants.

WEB COPY

One Brijnandan Kumar was occupying the premises, and once he vacated the premises, the entire amount relating to his electricity connection was paid.

9. However, contrary to the said statement, the bill shows that it was actually running in the name of Dhiraj Kumar and not Brijnandan Kumar.

10. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that it would suffice if his grievance is taken note of by the authorities and the respondents provide all the documents to establish that there indeed existed an electricity connection in the name of his father, Ramswaroop Yadav. If such documents are provided, the petitioner shall take the necessary steps and, if the amount is found to be due, the same be allowed to be cleared in installments.

11. In view of the just and fair submissions put forward by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court directs him to appear before the respondent no. 3, the Electrical Executive Engineer, Electric Supply Division, Gaya Ji (Urban) on 03.11.2026 at 11:00 AM armed with this order.

12. The concerned respondent no. 3 shall be entertaining the petitioner and thereafter, can fix a date according to his/her convenience when he/she shall provide all

WEB COPY

the documents to support their case that there indeed was an electricity connection in the name of his father, Ramswaroop Yadav for which payment demand has been made.

13. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that to show his bona fide, he is regularly paying the electricity bill so far as the meter running in his name is concerned.

14. Once the documents are handed over to the petitioner supporting the respondents' case, the rest of the 50% amount shall be paid by him in four equal installment.

15. The Electricity Department is duty bound to provide all the documents relating to **Consumer no. 227201274999** to make the petitioner know that it was installed and running in the name of his father, Ramswaroop Yadav. They are also required to give the details of the period between which the said consumer number was allotted to the petitioner's father and the date it was disconnected.

16. Alternatively, if no such consumer number is/are there in the name of his father, Ramswaroop Yadav, the petitioner shall be entitled to the refund of 50% deposited earlier.

17. With the aforesaid observation, **CWJC No. 8139 of 2025** stands disposed of.

WEB COPY

**MJC No. 2680 of 2025**

18. In view of the fact that the main writ petition of the petitioner stands disposed of, the present **MJC No. 2680 of 2025** also stands disposed of.

**(Rajiv Roy, J)**

Adnan/-

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **U** | | | |

WEB COPY