



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

W.P.(C) No.28766 of 2025

Parikshita Singh **Petitioner**

*Mr. Dolagobinda Mohapatra,
Advocate*

-versus-

Ombudsman-I, Odisha **Opp. Parties**
Electricity Regulatory
Commission,
Bhubaneswar & others

*Ms. Ruparekha Jena, Advocate
on behalf of
Mr. Lalit Kumar Maharana,
Advocate
(for opp. parties nos.3, 4 & 5)*

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.K. SAHOO
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S. MISHRA

ORDER

10.12.2025

Order No.

01.

This matter is taken up through Hybrid arrangement (video conferencing/physical mode).

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner-Parikshita Singh challenging the order dated 26.07.2023 passed by the learned Grievance Redressal Forum, Paradeep in Case No. GRF/ JED/ 262/2023 so also the order dated 28.12.2023 passed by the learned Ombudsman-I, Odisha Electricity Regulatory Commission, Bhubaneswar in Consumer Representation Case No.OM (I)-126 of 2023.



It appears that the petitioner had approached the learned Grievance Redressal Forum (for short called as "GRF") for supply of electricity to his premises and with a further prayer for disconnection of the power supply recorded in the name of the opposite party no.6- Niranjana Singh, who is admittedly the younger brother of the petitioner.

The learned GRF, after considering the case of the petitioner and the submissions of the opposite parties, has been pleased to direct the Executive Engineer, JED and SDO, Electrical, Jagatsinghpur, the opposite party nos.3 and 4 respectively to restore the existing power supply connection recorded in the name of the opposite party no.6 immediately after receipt of 30% of his arrear amount from the petitioner and further direction was issued to the said opposite parties to allow suitable installment to the petitioner for clearance of the balance of his proportionate share as per the norms of the Orissa Electricity Regulatory Commission Regulation.

The petitioner has challenged the order passed by the learned GRF before the learned Ombudsman-I and the learned Ombudsman-I found that the order of the learned GRF is quite justified and there was no occasion to interfere with the same and accordingly, directed the opposite parties to provide the electricity



connection to the petitioner strictly in accordance with the Orissa Electricity Regulation Commission Distribution (Condition of Supply) Code, 2019.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the petitioner had never applied for the electricity connection, but it was his younger brother, opposite party no.6- Niranjana Singh, who applied for the electricity connection in the name of the petitioner and he became the defaulter. He submitted that the opposite party no.6 has committed fraud on the petitioner and the petitioner has been wrongly treated as a consumer by the opposite parties.

It is further argued that recovering of the dues from the petitioner would not be in the interest of justice, particularly when the petitioner has never taken any electricity connection and he should not be penalized for the mischievous activities of his younger brother, the opposite party no.6 and therefore, both the orders passed by the learned GRF as well as by the Ombudsman-I should be set aside.

When we put a pertinent question to the learned counsel for the petitioner that for the fraudulent activities of the opposite party no.6 whether the petitioner has initiated any proceeding in any forum, the answer was in negative. Whether the opposite party no.6 has committed any fraud on the petitioner



or not, this Court is not to adjudicate the same. The power supply connection having been taken in the name of the petitioner and since there was default, therefore, the opposite party nos.3 and 4 are quite justified in raising the bills and asked the petitioner to make payment of such arrear dues and also disconnected the power supply.

We find no fault in the orders passed by both the afore-mentioned authorities and moreover, when the authorities have asked only for payment of 30% of the arrear dues and directed that the balance amount is to be paid in suitable installments, it appears that the authorities have acted very liberally and therefore, since there is no illegality in the orders, we are not inclined to interfere with the same.

Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(S.K. Sahoo)
Judge

(S.S. Mishra)
Judge