



W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 08.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR**

W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.11215 and 11217 of 2026

A.Rajasekaran

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Superintendent Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Circle,
Parvathipuram,
Nagercoil - 629 003.

2.Assistant Executive Engineer,
Distribution,
TNPDC, Kanyakumari.

3.Junior Engineer,
Electricity Department,
Kottaram, Kanyakumari District - 629 703.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned Final Assessment Order in AEE/D/KKI/DOC Final Asst. Ord/D. No.115/26 dated 02.05.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent and quash the same and consequently, to direct the respondents not to initiate coercive recovery proceedings or disconnect



W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

the petitioner's electricity service connections except by following due process of law.

For Petitioner :Mr.Ananth
For Respondents :Mr.M.Viji
for Mr.S.Deenadhayalan

ORDER

The petitioner challenges the final assessment order dated 02.05.2026 issued by the second respondent, whereby the petitioner is directed to pay a sum of Rs.1,78,201/- towards alleged theft of energy.

2.Earlier, the petitioner had challenged the provisional assessment order by filing W.P. (MD) No. 8968 of 2026. By order dated 02.04.2026, this Court allowed the writ petition and permitted the petitioner to submit his explanation to the provisional assessment order. The second respondent was directed to consider the explanation on its own merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

3.Pursuant to the said order, the petitioner submitted an explanation dated 15.04.2026, denying the allegation of theft of energy. A



W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

copy of the explanation is also produced along with the typed set of papers.

WEB COPY

4.A perusal of the impugned final assessment order reveals that although the second respondent has referred to the petitioner's explanation dated 15.04.2026, there is no discussion or consideration of the contents thereof. The impugned order neither accepts nor rejects the petitioner's explanation by assigning any cogent reasons. Thus, the order has been passed in violation of the directions issued by this Court. On this ground alone, the impugned order is liable to be set aside for violation of the principles of natural justice and for failure to pass a reasoned and speaking order.

5.Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed, and the impugned final assessment order dated 02.05.2026 issued by the second respondent is set aside. The second respondent is directed to consider the petitioner's explanation dated 15.04.2026 on its own merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law by assigning cogent reasons.



W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

6.The aforesaid exercise shall be completed within a period of four

(4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7.There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No

08.06.2026

cmr



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.

cmr

W.P.(MD)No.14919 of 2026

08.06.2026