

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 1375 of 2025**

Ejjarothu Gaddi Naidu

...Appellant

Vs.

State of Andhra Pradesh and others

...Respondents

Advocate for Appellant : Mr. Shaik Md. Umar Abdullah

Advocates for Respondents : Ms. K. Aishwarya Chowdary appearing
vice Mr. V. V. Satish, Standing Counsel
for APEPDCL**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO****DATE : 8th January 2026****P C :**

The present Writ Appeal, under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, has been preferred against the order, dated 15.12.2025, whereby interim relief has been refused to the appellant, who was the petitioner before the learned single Judge.

2. It appears from the order impugned that the power supply to the rice mill of the petitioner was disconnected on account of failure on the part of the petitioner to pay the electricity charges, which the petitioner claimed were excessive and that the assessment was not in accordance with the settled principles.

3. It appears that the petitioner lodged a complaint with the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (in short, 'the CGRF') in terms of the

remedy provided under the Electricity Act of 2003, which ultimately came to be rejected. In the meantime, it appears that the petitioner had also approached the District Consumer Forum, which partially allowed the complaint and directed the petitioner to pay an amount of Rs.16,000/- per month to the opposite party till disposal of the complaint before the Consumer Forum. The said amount of Rs.16,000/- is stated to have been paid consequent upon the interim directions passed by the Consumer Forum.

4. It needs to be pointed out here that at the time when the petitioner approached the District Consumer Forum, the electricity connection was not disconnected, which came to be done subsequently on 25.11.2025. Be that as it may, upon disconnection, the petitioner challenged the said action before the learned single Judge along with the decision rendered by the CGRF under the provisions of the Act of 2003.

5. By virtue of the order impugned, the learned single Judge, having noticed the contradiction between the two orders, came to a conclusion that the petitioner had failed to bring to the notice of the District Consumer Forum, Vizianagaram, regarding the orders passed by the CGRF. It is, in those circumstances, that interim relief was refused.

6. It is not denied that although the petitioner did have a remedy of challenging the order of CGRF before the Ombudsman, the aforementioned remedy was not availed.

7. On a perusal of the order impugned, it can be seen that while there may have been some contradiction between the order passed by the CGRF and that passed by the Consumer Forum, yet the fact that the Consumer Forum had already issued directions not to disconnect the service connection of the complainant and further that there was a direction to pay Rs.16,000/- per month to the opposite party, yet the issues raised in the writ petition, in our opinion, ought to have been considered notwithstanding the contradiction, which was so evident from the record.

8. In our opinion, the issue requires to be reconsidered by the learned single Judge on merits. We, accordingly, set aside the order impugned, dated 15.12.2025, and direct the reconsideration of the issue for grant of interim relief.

9. Registry to post W.P.No.34747 of 2025 before the learned single Judge having roster on 20.01.2026. This Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CJ

R RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

kbs

50

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.RAGHUNANDAN RAO**

W.A.No.1375 of 2025

Dt: 08.01.2026

kbs