

In the Supreme Court of Bangladesh
High Court Division
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

Present
Mr. Justice Sikder Mahmudur Razi
And
Mr. Justice Raziuddin Ahmed

Writ Petition No. 15306 of 2025

In the matter of:

An application under Article 102 of the
Constitution of the People's Republic of
Bangladesh.

In the matter of:

Gazipur Paper Board Ltd.

----- Petitioner.

-Versus-

Government of People's Republic of
Bangladesh, represented by the Secretary,
Ministry of power, Energy and Mineral
Resources Energy and Mineral Resources
Division, Bangladesh Secretariat, Ramana
Dhaka and others.

-----Respondents.

Mr. Jahid Hossain Dolon, Advocate

..... For the petitioner.

Mr. Ashfaque Rahman, Advocate

....For the respondent No. 2

Mr. Mohammad Mehdi Hasan, DAG with
Mr. Mohammad Rashadul Hassan, DAG with
Mr. Kamrul Islam, AAG with
Mr. Md. Shagar Hossain, AAG with
Mr. Bishwanath Karmaker, AAG with
Mr. S.K. Obaidul Haque (Wasim), AAG
---- For the Respondents-Government.

Heard and Judgment on: 26.11.2025

Sikder Mahmudur Razi, J.

In an application under Article 102 of the Constitution of the
People's Republic of Bangladesh, filed by Gazipur Paper Board

Limited the rule was issued in the instant matter in the following terms;

Let a Rule Nisi be issued calling upon the respondents to show cause as to why inaction and failure of the respondents to dispose of the representations of the petitioner dated 29.06.2025, 07.07.2025 and 02.09.2025 (Annexure-'C', 'C-1' and 'C-2' to the writ petition respectively) should not be declared to have been done without lawful authority and is of no legal effect and/or pass such other or further order or orders as to this court may seem fit and proper.

At the time of issuance of the rule, the respondents were further directed to dispose of the petitioner's application dated 29.06.2025, 07.07.2025 and 02.09.2025 as evident from Annexure-'C', 'C-1' and 'C-2' to the writ petition within 15 days from date.

Accordingly, the respondent No. 2 Titas Gas Transmission and Distribution Company Ltd. disposed of the letter of the petitioners vide letter dated 05.11.2025 and also communicated the same to the petitioner. The said disposal letter has also been placed before this court by way of filing affidavit in opposition by the respondent No. 2.

However, at this juncture, the petitioner filed another application for issuance of a supplementary rule, challenging the

disconnection report dated 23.06.2025, (Annexure-F and F-1) to the application and further prayed for reconnection of the gas line in question. When the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned advocate for the respondent No. 2 candidly submits that the authority *i.e.* respondent No. 2 is ready to give reconnection of the gas line in question subject to payment of all the dues as demanded by the authority. Even the learned advocate expressed the willingness of the authority to accept the dues in installment.

However, the learned advocate for the petitioner raised dispute regarding the amount of the bill and he tried to justify his position to the effect that there is no illegal gas connection or bypass connection as claimed in the report.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the matter, since the petitioner did not accept the proposal so offered by the respondent No. 2 to pay the entire outstanding dues in installment, rather raised dispute about the amount in question as well as the allegation raised by the respondent No. 2 authority, therefore, this court finds it difficult sitting on writ jurisdiction to inquire and investigate into those matters rather Bangladesh Energy regulatory Commission is the proper authority to adjudicate all the disputes.

Since the very subject matter of the instant writ petition was the inaction of the respondent to dispose of the applications of the petitioners and the applications have already been disposed of

accordingly, therefore, the very purpose of the instant writ petition has been accomplished and there remains nothing for this court to adjudicate.

Hence, the rule issued in the instant writ petition is discharged as being infructuous.

.....
(Sikder Mahmudur Razi, J.)

I agree

.....
(Raziuddin Ahmed, J.)