

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(C) No. 3539 of 2001

M/s G. N. Coke Manufacturing Co. Pvt. Ltd.. a Company incorporated under The Companies Act, 1956 having its factory at Chirkunda, District-Dhanbad through one of its Directors Sri Manoj Agarwal, son of Sri Gajanand Agarwal resident of Chirkunda, P.O. & P.S.Chirkunda, District Dhanbad.

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The Jharkhand State Electricity Board, a body constituted under the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 having its office at Nepal House, Ranchi through its Chairman
2. The General Manager cum Chief Engineer, Dhanbad Area Electricity Board, Dhanbad..
3. The Electrical Executive Engineer (Commercial & Revenue), Bihar State Electricity Board, Electric Supply Circle, Dhanbad.

... .. **Respondents**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Salona Mittal, Advocate
For the Resp.-JSEB : Mrs. Sweta Shukla, Advocate

04/21.01.2026

Learned counsel for the parties are present.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

“That in the instant writ application the petitioner prays for issuance of appropriate writ or a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the AMG bill for the year 2000-2001 which has been raised on contract demand which is not as per the agreement (100 KVA) but related to increase in maximum demand charges for the month of April, 2000 (113 KVA) AND for issuance of appropriate or writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the clause 16.5 of the Electricity Tariff 1993 related to surcharge for exceeding the contract demand as being highly unjustified, unwarranted, oppressive and which unjustly imposes abnormally heavy penalty on the consumers in the form of additional annual minimum guarantee charges (AMG) or minimum base charges (MBC), since AMG charges as per clause 16.5 is raised on the basis of highest KVA recorded on a particular day of any month during relevant year AND for issuance of any other appropriate writ (s), order (s) or direction (s) as would-be deemed fit and proper by Your Lordships in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has no instructions in the matter and accordingly this petition be dismissed as not pressed.
4. Learned counsel for the respondents has no objection to the prayer made.
5. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed as not pressed.
6. Pending interlocutory application, if any, is also dismissed as not pressed.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:21.01.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:22.01.2026