

D/L.28.
February 27, 2026.
KAUSHIK

WPA No. 25204 of 2025

Nirmal Naskar
Vs.
WBSEDCL & Ors.

Mr. Ashim Kumar Routh
Mr. Subhayan Barik
Ms. Ananya Mondal
Ms. Manishka Dhar
... for the petitioner

Mr. Sumitava Chakraborty
Ms. Bratati Pramanick
... for the respondent nos. 8 to 10

Mr. S. Bandyopadhyay
Mr. Tirthankar Dey
Mr. Arka Kumar Nag
... for the BMC

Mr. Srijan Nayak
Ms. Rituparna Maitra
... for the WBSEDCL

Mr. Jayanta Samanta
Mr. Manish Biswas
... for the State

The petitioner is aggrieved by an application for electricity connection made by the private respondent.

Briefly, the petitioner is the owner of a plot of land situated within the jurisdiction of Baguiati Police Station.

By a registered development agreement dated 8th February, 2021 and a subsequent registered Power of Attorney dated 10th February, 2021, the petitioner had entered into an agreement with the developer for construction of

a five storied building. It is now alleged by the petitioner that the entire premises has been constructed without any sanction plan. It is further submitted on behalf of the petitioner that there is no completion certificate and the entire property has been unauthorisedly constructed. In this background, the petitioner opposes the grant of any connection to the private respondent in respect of the premises.

On behalf of WBSEDCL, it is submitted that if the application is made in accordance with law and after compliance with all statutory formalities they would be in a position to grant an electricity connection to the petitioner. The decision cited on behalf of the petitioner in ***Rajendra Kumar Barjatya Vs. U.P. Avas Evam Vikas Parishad 2024 INSC 990*** is distinguishable and inapposite. In that decision, the general and omnibus direction in larger public interest is not applicable in such a case where the petitioner being the landlord owner is trying to agitate purely private disputes which they have against the private respondent. In any event, the grant or non-grant of electricity connection is yet to be adjudicated upon by WBSEDCL.

In such circumstances, the entire apprehension of the petitioner is premature and misconceived. The petitioner is trying to raise

personal disputes with the private respondent developer in a circuitous manner.

In view of the above, WPA 25204 of 2025 stands dismissed.

Liberty is granted to WBSEDCL to act in accordance with law and consider the application of the private respondent on merits.

(Ravi Krishan Kapur, J.)