



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 23RD DAY OF MARCH, 2026

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

WRIT PETITION NO.13842 OF 2025 (GM-KEB)

BETWEEN:

SRI CHANDRAPPA
S/O REVANASIDDAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,
R/AT #22, SHIVANAPURA,
DASANAPURA HOBLI,
NELAMANGALA TALUK,
BENGALURU RURAL-562123.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI DEVARAJA L.K., ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA,
DEPARTMENT OF KPTCL,
KAVERI BHAVAN, K.G. ROAD,
BENGALURU-560 009.
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.
2. THE ASSISTANT ELECTRICAL ENGG.,
BESCOM OFFICE, NELAMANGALA
#3, JYOTHI NAGAR,
B.H. ROAD, NELAMANGALA
BENGALURU RURAL-562123.
REPRESENTED BY MR. BYREGOWDA.
3. THE JUNIOR ELECTRICAL ENGG,
BESCOM OFFICE, NELAMANGALA
#3, JYOTHI NAGAR,
B.H. ROAD, NELAMANGALA
BENGALURU RURAL-562123.
REPRESENTED BY MR. PARASHURAM.





4. THE RAJU ELECTRICALS (CONTRACTOR)
BESCOM OFFICE, NELAMANGALA
#3, JYOTHI NAGAR,
B.H. ROAD, NELAMANGALA
BENGALURU RURAL-562123.
REPRESENTED BY MR. RAJENDRA.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI MANJUNATH RAYAPPA, AGA FOR R-1;
SRI C. CHANNEGOWDA, ADVOCATE FOR R-2 & R-3)

THIS WRIT PETITION IS FILED UNDER ARTICLES 226 AND 227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA, PRAYING TO ISSUE A WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER ORDER OR WRIT TO CONDUCT THE DEPARTMENTAL ENQUIRY BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1 AGAINST THE RESPONDENT NOS.2 AND 3; ISSUE A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS OR ANY OTHER APPROPRIATE WRIT TO BLOCK LIST THE RESPONDENT NO.4 BY THE RESPONDENT NO.1.

THIS PETITION COMING ON FOR PRELIMINARY HEARING, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

ORAL ORDER

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to regularize the electricity connection to the petitioner's property and to take action against respondent No. 4 -



contractor and to restrain respondent Nos. 2 and 3 from removing the installed electric meter.

BRIEF FACTS

2. The petitioner claims to have purchased site No. 22 formed in Sy. No. 132/2 situated at Shivanapura Village under a registered sale deed dated 27.05.2022 (Annexure-A). It is stated that a temporary electricity connection was obtained on 18.11.2023 for construction purposes, pursuant to which the petitioner constructed a three floor building and completed the same in November 2024. The petitioner further contends that for securing a permanent electricity connection, he approached respondent No. 4 - contractor and paid a sum of ₹.60,000/-. Though a meter was later installed, the same was not assigned any RR number or account ID and no regular billing was raised. Subsequently, dispute arose between petitioner and respondent No. 4 and the said amount was refunded. Thereafter respondent Nos. 2 and 3



BESCOM officials allegedly sought to remove the installed meter which led to the filing of the present writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that he is the lawful owner in possession of the property by virtue of the registered sale deed. It is contended that electricity connection is a basic amenity and denial/removal of the same is arbitrary and violative of Article 21. It is contended that the petitioner, despite payment and installation of the meter, the respondents have failed to regularize the connection. Further that the action of respondent Nos. 2 and 3 in attempting to remove the meter is illegal and without authority of law.

4. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 2 and 3 contended that the alleged installation of the meter is not through authorized procedure and does not confer any right on the petitioner. It is submitted that unless the petitioner complies with the statutory requirements including submission of documents and formal application, no permanent connection can be



granted. It is submitted that the installation without proper sanction is unauthorized and liable to be removed.

5. This Court has carefully considered the submission and perused the material on record. The primary relief sought is for regularization of an electricity connection and action against a private contractor. The same involves disputed questions of facts particularly with regard to payment of money, installation of meter and alleged misconduct of respondent No. 4. The petitioner asserts payment of ₹. 60,000/- and illegal conduct by respondent No. 4 which is denied. These issues require evidence and adjudication, which cannot be undertaken in a writ jurisdiction. It is not demonstrated that the petitioner has complied with the mandatory statutory requirements for obtaining a lawful permanent electricity connection through a competent authority. An unauthorized installation even if made does not confer any enforceable right. The grievance of the petitioner insofar as it relates to alleged misconduct or recovery of money



lies in appropriate proceedings, civil or criminal proceedings. Similarly, issues relating to electricity connection are governed by statutory mechanism under the Act. A writ of mandamus can be issued only when a legal right and a corresponding statutory duty are established. In the present case, the petitioner has failed to establish a clear legal right to seek regularization of an irregular connection. The action of respondent Nos. 2 and 3 in seeking to remove an unauthorized connection cannot be termed as arbitrary or illegal in the absence of compliance with the prescribed forms. This Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has made out no grounds and the writ petition is devoid of limits and accordingly it is ***dismissed.***

Sd/-

JUSTICE K.S. HEMALEKHA

CKL

List No.: 1 Sl No.: 29