



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.6130 of 2026

Gouranga Charan Panda

Petitioner

Mr. B. Dash, Advocate

-versus-

***Executive Engineer
(Marshaghai) TPCODL,
Kendrapara & Anr.***

Opposite Parties

Mr. A. Tripathy, AGA

Mr. L.K. Moharana, Adv. for TPCODL

CORAM:

JUSTICE BIRAJA PRASANNA SATAPATHY

ORDER

25.03.2026

Order No.

- 04.** 1. This matter is taken up through Hybrid Arrangement (Virtual/Physical) Mode.
- 2.** Heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties.
- 3.** Pursuant to the order dtd.17.03.2026, learned counsel appearing for the TPCODL fairly contended that prior to disconnecting the power supply to the Petitioner's premises on 24.09.2025, no such notice was issued to the Petitioner. However, notice was issued to the son of the Petitioner, who has also a consumer under the Opposite Party-TPCODL, basing on the report prepared by the concerned authority on 21.08.2025.



4. It is also contended that son of the Petitioner has been held liable to pay sum of Rs.51,315/- vide notice dtd.22.08.2025 so enclosed to the affidavit filed by Opposite Party Nos.1 and 2 on 24.03.2026.

5. Mr. B. Das, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner on the other hand contended that since without issuing any notice, which is not disputed, power supply has been disconnected, this Court may pass appropriate order against the Opposite Party-TPCODL.

6. To the submission made by the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner, Mr. L.K. Moharana, learned counsel appearing for the TPCODL, fairly contended that because of the fault committed by the Opposite Party the demand raised against the son of the Petitioner vide notice dtd.22.08.2025 will not be realized and appropriate order will be passed in recalling the demand so issued vide order dtd.22.08.2025 within a period of seven (7) days hence.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner also fairly contended that if the demand raised against the other consumer so assessed vide notice dtd.22.08.2025 will be recalled, Petitioner will have no grievance.

8. Having heard learned counsel appearing for the Parties and considering the submissions made, this Court while disposing the Writ Petition by deprecating



the action of the TPCODL in disconnecting the power supply to the Petitioner's premises without any prior notice, but considering the submission that the demand raised against the other consumer vide notice dtd.22.08.2025 will be withdrawn, this Court is not inclined to pass any adverse order against the Opposite Party-TPCODL. Opposite Party No.2 is directed to withdraw the demand so raised against the other consumer vide notice dtd.22.08.2025, within a period of seven (7) days hence.

9. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(Biraja Prasanna Satapathy)
Judge

Subrat