06.10.2026
Sl.13
Ct.652
sk

WPA 28289 of 2026

Dilip Paul
-vs-
W.B.S.E.D.C.L. & Ors.

Mr. Gazi Faruque Hosain
Ms. Varsha Roy
…for the petitioner

Mr. S. Chattopadhyay
….for the WBSEDCL

1. Affidavit of service filed by the petitioner is taken on record.
2. The instant writ petition is filed by the petitioner seeking restoration of electricity connection at his premises at L/ 221, Sukanta Nagar, Salt Lake City, Sector-IV, Kolkata-700098 .
3. Mr. Hosain, learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been pressurized for various personal reasons for prolonged period of time which resulted into his inattention as regards payment of electricity bill dated 16.1.2023 of an amount of Rs. 856/-.
4. Hence, the electricity connection of the petitioner's premises was disconnected on and from 24th March, 2023.
5. Learned advocate for the petitioner has also submitted about various personal reasons of the petitioner which are serious in nature, stating those to have restrained petitioner to

take an appropriate action to get the electricity reconnected to his premises.

6. Now on 6th August, 2026, the petitioner writes to the Station Manager, Bidhannagar-III Customer Care Centre for restoration of connection of electricity in his premises after mutating his name as to the existing meter, since earlier meter was in the name of his father, now deceased.

7. According to the respondent authority represented by Mr. Chattopadhyay, learned advocate, neither the old meter can be restored at the premises of the petitioner as prayed for nor a new meter can be installed over there. He has referred to Clause 4.6 (Deemed Termination of Agreement) of West Bengal Electricity Regulatory Commission (Electricity Supply Code), Regulations, 2013 dated 7th August, 2013 to submit that upon expiry of a period of 180 days from the date of disconnection at the premises of the petitioner. the agreement is deemed to have been terminated between the licensee and the petitioner, by operation of the regulation as above.

8. It is further submitted that since the petitioner's premises belongs within the area of East Kolkata Wet Land, the respondent is restrained to provide any new connection in the area, pursuant to the order of this Court.

9. It appears that the premises of the petitioner was duly enabled with electricity connection by a meter earlier installed in the name of the deceased father of the petitioner. Due to the bill amount remaining due for the period from December 2022 to January 2023, the said line has been disconnected by the respondent authority on 24th March, 2023. Prima facie, I find substance in the submission made on behalf of the respondent authority that due to application of Clause 4.6 of Regulation 2013 as mentioned above the old agreement which once stood operative between the father of the petitioner and the respondent/licensee, has now lapsed. There is also impediment for grant of new connection to the petitioner's premises which is situated within the periphery of East Kolkata wet land area.

10. However, the Court is also not oblivion of the incidents for the writ petitioner not being able to put forth his grievance or take appropriate

action within the permissible time limit. Those appear to be beyond control of the petitioner and his inaction as bona fide. The Court finds that such grounds of the petitioner may be considered by the respondent authority, before finally applying Regulation 4.6 of the Regulations of 2013 in case of the present petitioner.

11. It is therefore, directed that the petitioner files a comprehensive representation before the respondent no.4/Station Manager, Bidhannagar-III elaborately stating grounds/ reasons for not being able to follow up after disconnection, with adequate and sufficient corroborating document with the same.

12. Let, the respondent No.4, upon submission of such comprehensive representation by the petitioner before it, consider the same, after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

13. The respondent no. 4 shall thereafter pass a reasoned order, within a period of eight weeks from the date of submission of comprehensive representation by the petitioner before it.

14. With the direction as above, the writ petition is disposed of.

15. Since no affidavit-in-opposition is called for in the instant case, the allegation if any, made in the writ petition is deemed to have been denied and disputed by the respondent authority.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J)