



WEB COPY



W.P.No.2437 of .

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 18.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

W.P.No. 2437 of 2026
&
W.M.P.No. 2684 of 2026

1.N.John Wesley

2.N James Wesley

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.J.Saradha

2.S.Jones

3.The Managing Director / Chairman
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDCCL)
Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

4.The Assistant Executive Engineer (O&M)
110/33/11KV, Kodambakkam SS Complex,
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDCCL)

1/10



W.P.No.2437 of .

No.46-1, Sivan Koil Street,
Rangarajapuram, South-I,
Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024.

5.The Assistant Engineer (O&M)
110/33/11KV, Kodambakkam SS Complex,
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDC)
No.46-1, Sivan Koil Street,
Rangarajapuram, South-I,
Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Section 226 of the Constitution of India for issue of Writ of Mandamus, directing the 5th respondent to cancel / rescind the commercial electricity connection granted to the 1st respondent in respect of the terrace premises situated at No.135, 6th Street, Kamaraj Colony, Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024.

For petitioner : Mr. J.Satheesh

For Respondents : No Appearance
1 & 2

For Respondents : Mr. L.Jaivenkatesh
3 to 5



W.P.No.2437 of .

ORDER

This writ petition is filed is filed for the following relief:

“To direct the 5th respondent to cancel / rescind the commercial electricity connection granted to the 1st respondent in respect of the terrace premises situated at No.135, 6th Street, Kamaraj Colony, Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024”.

2. The petitioners would submit that they are the owners of the premises in question through a settlement deed dated 26.07.2023 executed by their grand father, Selvaraj. The said Selvaraj had rented out the first floor to his third son S.Jones on a monthly rental agreement dated 01.09.2009. After executing the settlement deed in favour of the petitioners, the 2nd respondent became a tenant of the petitioners. Since the 2nd respondent failed to pay rents the petitioner filed RLTOP.No.392 of 2025 on the file of X Small Causes Court, Chennai. The 1st respondent is the 2nd respondent's wife.



W.P.No.2437 of .

3. The petitioners would submit that respondents 1 and 2 had constructed an iron shed in the open terrace and were running a Church in the name of Nesarin Sanththam Gospel Ministries Trust and were inviting public for worship and congregational prayers and were using amplifiers and musical instruments.

4. The petitioners would submit that the 2nd respondent through the 1st respondent had sought for separate electricity connection for the aforesaid shed. By order dated 09.07.2025, the 5th respondent rejected the application on the ground that the 2nd respondent is not a registered owner of the premises. Aggrieved by the rejection order, the 1st respondent filed WP.No.27769 of 2025, on the file of this Court. A representation was made on the side of the respondent board that if an application is submitted along with indemnity bond, electricity connection would be provided on the payment of necessary charges. Accordingly, the said writ petition was allowed on 16.12.2025.



W.P.No.2437 of .

WEB COPY

5. The petitioners would submit that though they were shown as respondents in the said writ petition, without their counter and hearing their arguments the said writ petition was ordered. This was challenged by the petitioners by filing WA.No.4035 of 2025. It was represented that service connection had already been provided on 24.12.2025. Recording the same, the writ appeal was dismissed, giving liberty to the appellants to challenge the same in the manner known to law. Therefore, the petitioners are before this Court.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that in the judgement of the writ appeal, a liberty has been granted to challenge the electricity connection in the manner known to law.

7. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondent board would submit that the remedy available to the petitioner is not by filing a separate writ petition.



W.P.No.2437 of .

WEB COPY

records.

8. Heard the learned counsels on the either side and perused the

9. Admittedly, this Court had passed the following order in
WP.No.27769 of 2025:

“5.Considering the submissions made by either parties, this Court directs the petitioner to make fresh application along with the indemnity bond. On execution of such indemnity bond and payment of necessary charges, the 3rd respondent is directed to provide fresh electricity service connection to the petitioner’s premises ‘within a period of two weeks.’”

10. The records would show that the petitioners herein were represented by their counsel. This order was challenged by the petitioners in WA.No.4035 of 2025. The Division Bench had observed that in WP.No.27769 of 2025, this Court had only directed the petitioners therein to submit a fresh application and therefore no



W.P.No.2437 of .

grounds were made out for entertaining the writ appeal. In case a civil suit is pending the parties could workout remedies in the manner known to law. They have also gone on to state that if the appellants are aggrieved by the grant of new service connection they are at liberty to challenge it in the manner known to law.

11. The electricity service connection has been granted to the 1st respondent only on the basis of the orders of this Court in WP.No.27769 of 2025. Therefore, without seeking a review of that order present writ petition has been filed. Unless and until the order in WP.No.27769 of 2025 is set aside, this Court cannot pass any direction contrary to the order passed in WP.No.27769 of 2025, more particularly when the writ appeal filed by the petitioners had been dismissed.

12. The arguments of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the Bench had given them a liberty to challenge the new service connection cannot be countenanced since the bench had only opined that the challenge should be done in the manner known to law. Without reviewing the order in WP.No.27769 of 2025, the petitioners cannot



W.P.No.2437 of .

seek to cancel the electricity granted to the 1st respondent.

WEB COPY

13. In view of the above, this writ petition is dismissed.

However, it is well open to the petitioners to file a review petition.

Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

18.02.2026

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

kan



W.P.No.2437 of .

To

WEB COPY

1.The Managing Director / Chairman
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDC)
Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

2.The Assistant Executive Engineer (O&M)
110/33/11KV, Kodambakkam SS Complex,
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDC)
No.46-1, Sivan Koil Street,
Rangarajapuram, South-I,
Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024.

3.The Assistant Engineer (O&M)
110/33/11KV, Kodambakkam SS Complex,
Tamil Nadu Power Distribution
Corporation Ltd. (TNPDC)
No.46-1, Sivan Koil Street,
Rangarajapuram, South-I,
Kodambakkam, Chennai - 600 024.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.2437 of .

P.T. ASHA, J

kan

W.P.No.2437 of 2026

18.02.2026