

Recd. On : 10/05/2018
 Registered on : 10/05/2018
 Decided on : 19/06/2019
 Duration : 1Y/1M/09D

BEFORE THE HON'BLE 2nd ADDITIONAL DISTRICT COURT
 AT VANTHALI.

Sp.Civil Suit (Ele.) No.35 of 2018
Old Sp. Civil Suit No.57 of 2018

Exhibit : 30

Pashchim Gujarat Vij Company Ltd.,
 Through The Deputy Engineer, PGVCL,
 Sub-Division,
 Manavadar,
 Dist. Junagadh

::::::::::::::::Plaintiff.

Versus

Govindbhai Premjibhai Solanki,
 Age : 45 years, Caste : Hindu,
 Occu. : Agriculture,
 Resi. : Khadiya, Tal. Manavadar
 DIST. JUNAGADH

::::::::::::::::Defendant

Subject: Suit for Recovery of **Rs.12,233.09 ps.**,
 under Section 154(5) of the Electricity
 Act, 2003.

APPEARANCES :

Mr. D.B. Raval, Ld. Advocate for the plaintiff.

-:: J U D G M E N T ::-

1. The plaintiff-company has filed the present
 suit against the defendant for recovery of
Rs.12,233.09 ps. along with 18% p.a. towards delay

payment charges and costs.

2. The facts leading to this suit, in brief, are as under:-

It is the case of the plaintiff company that it is a successor company under the Gujarat Electricity Industries (Re-organization & Comprehensive Transfer) Scheme- 2003 of the Gujarat Electricity Board and has come into existence under the order of the Government of Gujarat. The Company has accepted all the responsibilities, debt, interest and authorities of the old Gujarat Electricity Board. It is further case of the plaintiff that the plaintiff company is having its Head Office at Rajkot and its Sub-Division office at Rural Area of Manavadar Taluka. The plaintiff is the Deputy Engineer of the Manavadar Sub-Division-2 of District Junagadh and he is authorised officer of the company and he has right to sign the plaint, file affidavit etc. It is the case of the plaintiff further, that the plaintiff company is supplying the electricity to the consumer.

2.1. It is the case of the plaintiff that the defendant is residing at Khadiya village of Taluka Manavadar of Junagadh District. It is the case of the plaintiff, further, that the present defendant has unauthorisedly taken direct electric connection from the electric line of the plaintiff for the residential purpose. That the plaintiff usually

makes sudden installation checking of legal as well as illegal connections. That the Officers of the plaintiff Company has done such sudden checking of the Residential place of direct connection of the defendant on **30/09/2016** and found that the defendant has committed power theft and, therefore, the electricity theft was found being done by the defendant and a detailed rojakam and checking report were prepared at the place.

1(B). It is the case of the plaintiff, further, that a Power Theft supplementary bill for **Rs.12,233.09 ps.** towards the electricity theft as per ABCD formula and the report of the Checking Officer has been given to the defendant. That the plaintiff has prayed for 18% p.a. delay payment charges as per the rules & regulations of the company. The plaintiff-company has prayed for recovery of **Rs.9,689.58 ps.** towards power theft bill and **Rs.2,543.51** towards D.P.C. In all, they have prayed for **Rs.12,233.09 ps.** The plaintiff-company issued notice on 15/05/2017 to the defendant, but the defendant did not care to pay the outstanding dues and therefore, the plaintiff has filed this suit for recovery of the due amount. Filing present suit, plaintiff prays to grant relief of the present suit for recovery of the suit amount together with interest at the rate of 18% p.a., from the person and property of the defendant and the plaintiff has prayed to pass

decree in its favour.

2. On presentation of the plaint, summons was issued to the defendant. But neither the defendant nor any one on his behalf appeared before this Court, therefore, this Court passed an ex-parte order was passed and hence, the matter be proceeded ex-parte against the defendant.

3. The plaintiff-side has led the oral evidence and produced the documentary evidence as under:-

(A) Oral evidence:-

1 Exh. 11 Affidavit-in-Chief on behalf of
the plaintiff — Rameshbhai
Nathabhai Chotaliya

(B) Documentary evidence:-

1 Exh. 13 Application for filing civil
suit
2 Exh. 14 Praforma No. 12
3 Exh. 15 Case History
4 Exh. 16 D.P.C. Charge Sheet
5 Exh. 17 Office Order
6 Exh. 18 Court fee granted letter
7 Exh. 19 Rojkam
8 Exh. 20 Notice
9 Exh. 21 Letter regarding supplementary
bill
10 Exh. 22 Supplementary Bill
11 Exh. 23 Checking Sheet No.46316
12 Exh. 24 Seizure list
13 Exh. 25 Acknowledgment sleep/cover
14 Exh. 26 Ledger Copy
15 Exh. 27 Calculation Sheet
16 Exh. 28 FIR

4. The defendant side has neither submitted any

documentary evidence nor led any oral evidence. The plaintiff-side has submitted closing pursis at Exhibit 29. Heard, the arguments of Learned Advocate on behalf of the plaintiff.

5. This Court has framed the following issues at Exhibit-10 for my determination :

- ૧ શું વાદી સંસ્થા પુરવાર કરે છે કે, તા. ૩૦/૦૮/૧૬ ના રોજ પ્રતિવાદીનાં આખા ગામે તેઓના રહેઠાણ પર વીજ ચેકીંગ દરમ્યાન તેઓની સર્વિસ લાઈન ઉપરથી ટેપિંગ કરી બીન અધિકૃત ડાયરેક્ટ વાયર જોડી ગેરકાયદેસર રીતે વીજ વપરાશ કરતા પકડાઈ ગયેલ ?
- ૨ શું વાદી સંસ્થા પુરવાર કરે છે કે, ચેકીંગના દિવસે ચેકીંગ શીટ નં. ૪૬૩૧૬ ની તૈયાર કરી અને લોડની ગણતરી કરી તા. ૦૧/૧૦/૧૬ ના રોજ રુ. ૮,૬૮૮-૫૮ પૈસા નું વીજ ચોરીનું બીલ પ્રતિવાદીને આપવામાં આવેલ ?
- ૩ શું વાદી સંસ્થા પુરવાર કરે છે કે, પ્રતિવાદીને વીજ ચોરી બાબતે નાણાં ભરપાઈ કરવા કાયદેસર નોટીસ પાઠવેલી છે ?
- ૪ શું વાદી સંસ્થા પ્રતિવાદી પાસેથી રુ. ૧૨,૨૩૩-૦૮ પૈસા ડીલે પેમેન્ટ ચાર્જીસ સાથે વસુલ મેળવવા હકકદાર છે ?
- ૫ શું વાદી વ્યાજ મેળવવા હકકદાર છે ? જો હા તો કેટલા ટકા ?
- ૬ શું હુકમ અને શું હુકમનામું ?

6. The following are the answers to the above issues in light of the material available on record:-

- (1) In the affirmative.
- (2) In the affirmative.
- (3) In the affirmative.
- (4) In the negative.
- (5) Partly in affirmative, @ 9 % p.a. from the date of filing of the suit.
- (6) As per final order.

-: R E A S O N S :-

FOR ISSUE NOS. 1 TO 3 :

7. Above issues are interconnected and inter linked with each other and findings of one issue depends upon another and to avoid frequent repetition of the facts; I have decided to discuss the above issues together by common discussion and reasoning for the sake of convenience.

8. To prove the suit, the plaintiff has submitted oral evidence of Rameshbhai Nathabhai Chotaliya, the Dy.Engineer of the plaintiff-company, in form of affidavit at Exh.11. He has stated the facts as per the plaint at Exhibit 1. Therefore, to avoid repetition, the same is not reproduced here. Further, the witness has produced the documentary evidence identifying the signatures and contents. The witness has not been cross examined by the defendant-side as the matter was ordered to be proceeded ex parte against the defendant, by passing an order on 03/12/2018.

9. The plaintiff-side has produced documentary evidence at Exhibit 13 to 28 in support of its case. The defendant-side has not produced any documentary evidence nor led any oral evidence on record.

10. It is crystal clear that the officers of the

plaintiff-company went for checking at the residential place of the defendant at Khadiya village of Taluka Manavdar, Junagadh District. It is the case of the plaintiff, further, that the present defendant has unauthorisedly taken direct electric connection from the electric line of the plaintiff for the agricultural purpose. That the plaintiff is making sudden installation checking of legal as well as illegal connections. That the Officers of the plaintiff Company has done such sudden checking of the Residential place of direct connection of the defendant on 30/09/2016 and found that the defendant has committed power theft and, therefore, the electricity theft was found being done by the defendant and a detailed rojkam and checking report were prepared at the place and bill of Rs.9,689.58 ps. Was given to the defendant on 01/10/2016. Looking to Exh.20 i.e. notice and Exh.25 i.e. acknowledgment sleep, it is crystal clear that the plaintiff-company has sent legal notice to the defendant to pay the dues, which was received by the defendant but, defendant did not care to pay the dues. Hence, my answers to issue nos.1 to 3 in the affirmative.

ISSUE NO.4 :-

11. On perusal of the Office order, case history and the Supplementary Bill and other details, it prima facie appears that the defendant has obtained direct electric connection for residential purpose

from the plaintiff company and the plaintiff has shown Rs.9,689.58 ps. for power theft, and Rs.2,543.51 towards the D.P.C. Charges. Therefore, the total amount of Rs.12,233.09 ps, are due as per the Ledger against the defendant from the plaintiff. Therefore, it is crystal clear that the amount due is within the period of limitation and that is why the plaintiff is entitled to recover the said suit amount from the defendant.

12. Moreover, the plaintiff has not submitted any documentary or oral evidence that can support to prove the conditions regarding D.P.C. charges laid down during the agreement between the plaintiff and the defendant and that is why the plaintiff is not entitled to claim D.P.C. charges of Rs.2,543.51, as per ledger. For D.P.C. charges, the plaintiff has failed to bring sufficient evidence and that is why, I do not find it fit to grant any relief regarding the D.P.C. charges. Therefore the plaintiff is entitled to get the due amount excluding D.P.C. i.e. Rs.9,689.58 ps. Above evidence of the plaintiff has not been challenged by the defendant by way of producing any documentary evidence and there is no reason to disbelieve the plaintiff. Considering the entire oral as well as documentary evidence as a whole, the defendant has neither appeared before this Court nor produced any rebuttal, contrary, cogent and convincing defending evidence on record. The

plaintiff has also not been cross-examined by the defendant. Under these circumstances, as discussed above, I have no hesitation to conclude that the plaintiff-Company is entitled to recover an amount of Rs.9,689.58 ps., from the defendant as legal and valid dues. Therefore, I am of the view that the plaintiff Company has successfully proved its dues as stated in the suit. Hence, I answer Issue No.4 in the negative.

ISSUE NO.5

13. On perusal of entire record, it transpires that there is no agreement of interest between the plaintiff and the defendant. In light of the Section 34 of C.P.C., if there is no agreement of interest between the parties, the Court can pass order for prevailing rate of interest. In this case the defendant is not refunding the outstanding amount to the plaintiff; the defendant is liable to pay interest and there is no agreement between the parties too, in these circumstances, in the interest of justice, prevailing interest can be granted. Considering the principle laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court of India regarding interest charges, prevailing rate of interest i.e. 9 % per annum may be granted from the date of filing of the suit till the realization of the decretal amount. Hence, I answer issue No.5 partly in the affirmative and award interest at the rate of 9% p.a. on the decretal amount from the date of the

suit till its realization.

14. **ISSUE NO.6:-**

Considering all the above facts and circumstances of the case and evidence on record, the plaintiff is partly entitled for the relief as stated above and hence, I pass the following order in the interest of justice:-

: O R D E R :-

The plaintiff's suit is partly allowed.

The plaintiff is entitled to recover Rs.9,689.58 ps. (Rupees Nine Thousand Six Hundred Eighty Nine and Fifty Eight Paise only) alongwith interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of the suit till actual realization of the amount from the defendant.

The defendant to pay the costs of the suit to the plaintiff and bear his own.

Decree to be drawn accordingly.

Signed & Pronounced in the open court today on this **19th Day of June 2019**

Date :19/06/2019 (PADMANABH GOVARDHANRAY VYAS)
Place : VANTHALI 2nd ADDL.DISTRICT JUDGE,
VANTHALI
GJ00389