

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH AT KARACHI

CP D 2847 of 2023

DATE	ORDER WITH SIGNATURE OF JUDGE
------	-------------------------------

1. For order on office objection
2. For hearing of Misc. No.14384/2023
3. For hearing of main case

**16.04.2025**

Petitioner, Mst. Shamim Akhtar, is present in person

Mr. Iftikhar Ahmed advocate for respondent along with Mr. Khaldoon Arif, Deputy Manager and Pir Bux Baloch, Manager, Legal Co-ordination

This petition, pending since 2023, seeks the following relief:

- (a) *Direct the Respondent No. 1 to cancel the license of Respondent No. 2 as life of people have become miserable due to their illegal, unlawful, deliberate and malafide act.*
- (b) *Direct the official respondents of K-Electric (Respondent No. 2 to 6) to withdraw all the excessive and hefty electricity bills of petitioner's house (Account No. 0400028231747) which were issued to the petitioner illegally and malafidely and return back the extra amount to the petitioner.*
- (c) *Direct the official respondents of K-Electric (Respondent No. 2 to 6) to pay fine/penalty to the petitioner for teasing them and wasting their precious time.*
- (d) *Direct the official respondents of K-Electric (Respondent No. 2 to 6) not to disconnect the electricity of the petitioner's house till the decision of this petition.*
- (e) *Direct the official respondents of K-Electric (Respondent No. 2 to 6) to send correct bills to the petitioner according to the actual reading/consumption of electricity of power 1 KW instead of 3.5 KW from the date of sending excessive amount of bills.*
- (f) *Direct the official respondents of K-Electric (Respondent No. 2 to 6) to produce complete record of electricity bills of Account No. 0400028231747 from the date of issuance of this account number.*
- (g) *Any other relief(s) as this Honourable Court may deem fit and appropriate under the circumstances of the case may also be granted.*

The petitioner stated that electricity was being availed vide a *kunda connection* for which wrongful billing was taking place. Learned counsel for the private respondent stated that the petitioner was stealing electricity and efforts at amelioration were met with violent resistance.

The utility service is a public limited company and no case was articulated to demonstrate its amenability to writ jurisdiction in present circumstances. While the prayer clause sets forth a case of contractual dispute, however, we are unassisted of how the same can be agitated in writ jurisdiction. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it is *admitted* that the petitioner is benefitting from a *kunda connection*, hence, no case is made out to perpetuate an illegality. The allegations and counter allegations raise factual controversy, not

amenable for adjudication in writ jurisdiction. Therefore, the petition is found to be misconceived, hence, dismissed.

Judge

Judge

*Amjad*