2026:AHC:226933-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 27119 of 2026

Kailashpati Rai

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Nirbhay Kumar Bharti
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Pawan Kumar Mishra

Court No. - 21

HON'BLE ARINDAM SINHA, J.
HON'BLE SATYA VEER SINGH, J.

1. Petitioner seeks interference on quashing of the electricity bill. Prayer 'A' is reproduced below.

> *"A. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the recovery of the impugned inflated bills dated January 2026, 22.04.2026, and 23.04.2026 (Annexure No.3 to writ petition)."*

Mr. Nirbhay Kumar Bharti, learned advocate appears for petitioner, Mr. Raj Mohan Upadhyay, learned advocate, Additional Chief Standing Counsel, for State and Mr. Pawan Kumar Mishra, learned advocate, for respondent nos.2 to 4 (the supply company).

2. Paragraphs 1 to 3 from earlier order dated 15th October, 2026 are reproduced below.

> *"1. Mr. Pawan Kumar Mishra, learned advocate appears for respondent nos. 2 to 4 (the supply company). He hands up his instructions dated 9th October, 2026. Mr. Nirbhay Kumar Bharti, learned advocate appears for petitioner and points out the bill dated 23rd April, 2026 from the instructions. It is said to be the revised bill. On first page of it there is mention of a water pump of capacity 1 HP. The same pump is reflected in second page of the bill but said to have capacity of 7 HP. Mr. Mishra submits, the pump is of capacity 1 HP.*
>
> *2. Petitioner had pointed out discrepancy in the bill, which is why the*

supply company had raised revised bill. There appears to be apparent discrepancy in the revised bill as well. On query Mr. Bharti produces copy of the bill received by his client. It is of one page mentioning the pump to have capacity of 1 HP, corresponding to first page of the bill disclosed in the instructions.

3. Petitioner has adjournment for being heard in event his challenge in respect of the bill received by him remains outstanding on the pump having capacity of 1 HP."

Today Mr. Bharti submits, there be direction for raising correct bill, which his client will pay.

3. On query we comprehend that petitioner is labouring under misconception. It is not that amount Rs.19,008/- demanded on bill dated 19th September, 2025 was increased to Rs.97,070/-, three days later. In former bill there was demand made. The bill at page 43 is dated 25th April, 2026 demanding aggregate Rs.97,070/-. Disconnection was to happen thereafter on 9th May, 2026 by reason of the bills remaining unpaid. We are satisfied, the discrepancy due to erroneous mention in respect of the pump capacity (1 HP and 7 HP) has no bearing on the demand raised. Petitioner's pump has capacity of 1 HP.

4. The supply company to raise consolidated bill within a week from communication of certified copy of this order to respondent no.3 (the Executive Engineer). Petitioner will do well to pay the demand and get restoration of the connection.

5. The writ petition is disposed of.

(Arindam Sinha,J.)

(Satya Veer Singh,J.)

November 2, 2026
Salim

Digitally signed by :-
SALIM PRAVEJ
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad