

**OFFICE OF ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN**

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act of 2003)  
**B-53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057**  
(Phone: 011-41009285 E.Mail elect\_ombudsman@yahoo.com)

**Appeal No. 02/2026**

(Against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 10.12.2025 in CG. No.115/2025)

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Shri Sachin Kumar

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)

**Present:**

Appellant: Shri Sachin Kumar with his spouse Smt. Gurpreet Kaur.

Respondent: Shri Jamal Nasir, Sr. Manager, Shri Jagdeep Sangwan, HOD,  
& Shri Pardeep Singh, HOG, on behalf of the TPDDL

Date of Hearing: 06.03.2026

Date of Order: 09.03.2026

**ORDER**

1. Appeal No.02/2026 has been filed by Shri Sachin Kumar, R/o 2188/2A, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Khampur, Main Patel Road, Opp. Metro Pillar No.225, Delhi - 110008, against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 10.12.2025 passed in CG No.115/2025.

2. The background of the case, as per the Appellant (registered consumer of CA No. 60024696308 installed at the aforementioned 2<sup>nd</sup> floor) in his complaint presented to the Forum, stated that he originally converted category of his electricity connection, from 'Domestic' to 'Non-Domestic' in 2019 to facilitate intended commercial use. However, the Appellant contended that the premises remained vacant and no commercial use was there from 2021 onwards, during this period all fixed charges were duly paid by him. Seeking to revert the premises to residential use, the Appellant applied for category conversion on 02.07.2025 (Notification No. 2041703629). While a field site visit was conducted on 04.07.2025,

the Respondent allegedly failed to communicate any conclusion until the matter was escalated during separate proceedings of one matter before the Ombudsman. Subsequently, the Respondent issued a deficiency/rejection letter dated 31.07.2025, which stated that domestic activity was not found as renovation work was going on during site visit. The Appellant challenged this rejection immediately through an e-mail & termed the rejection as arbitrary and a certain deficiency in service, asserting that the Respondent ignored evidence of photographs which established ongoing residential renovations and subjected the consumer to undue harassment by ignoring e-mails and advising him for applying a fresh application.

The Appellant contended that after shifting to the premises, he applied again on 28.08.2025 (Notification No.20422437269) and repeatedly requested for a category change from non-domestic to domestic. Respondent failed to conduct a site inspection till 20.09.2025 until the matter was escalated to CEO of TPDDL by him on 18.09.2025. On 24.09.2025, the Respondent issued both rejection notice and also a demand note, which was subsequently attributed to a "technical glitch" by the Respondent's admission. Despite this acknowledged error, the Respondent continued to levy charges under the non-domestic tariff until 25.09.2025 and failed to properly account for or reverse the Appellant's security deposit amount. The Appellant further alleged that the conversion process was intentionally delayed, resulting in wrongful billing at higher commercial rates, causing him undue harassment and financial loss. Even the Internal Consumer Grievance Redressal Cell (ICGRC) initially confirmed the domestic conversion effective from 28.08.2025, but the Appellant alleged subsequent manipulation of records. The Respondent issued an inflated bill (11 days) dated 08.10.2025, which reflected false arrears adjustment amounting to Rs.12,303/- and a further unexplained demand of Rs.1,390/-. Such conduct is not only negligent and unethical but also constitutes harassment through the imposition of arbitrary and manipulative charges. Therefore, the Appellant sought directions to the Respondent to, (i) Rectify billing records to reflect the correct consumer category; (ii) Refund or adjust all excess charges accrued due to the delay in category conversion; (iii) Restore the security deposit to its original status; (iv) Initiate disciplinary proceedings against the erring officials of TPDDL for administrative lapses; (v) Award compensation for the mental agony and financial loss caused by the Respondent's conduct; (vi) issue a written apology and ensure no further discrimination or retaliation takes place.

3. The Discom, in its written submission dated 10.11.2025, presented before the Forum that the Appellant had applied for category change from non-domestic to domestic against CA No.60024696308 installed at house no.2188/2A, Plot



No.2188/1 to 3, Second Floor, Main Patel Road, Village Shadi Khampur, Delhi – 110008 with the sanctioned load of 3 KW. The sequence of events are as under:

**(i) 1<sup>st</sup> Request vide Notification No. 2041703629 - alongwith site photograph**

- 02.07.2025 - Category change applied.
- 31.07.2025 - Request cancelled due to domestic activity was not found at site during Site Verification Report dated 04.07.2025 as renovation work was going on.

**(ii) 2<sup>nd</sup> Request vide Notification No. 2042243729 - alongwith site photograph**

- 28.08.2025 - Category change applied.
- From 29.08.2025 to 15.09.2025 - Case stuck in SAP due to IT error.
- 20.09.2025 - Site visit carried out.
- 24.09.2025 - Demand Note generated.
- 25.09.2025 - Category changed.
- 01.10.2025 - Excess security deposit amount has been adjusted.
- 08.10.2026 - Bill revised on domestic tariff for delay due to IT error.

Total adjustment of Rs.12,303/- (Rs.10,800/- security deposit + Rs.1,013/- credit from 08.09.2025 to 01.10.2025 on domestic tariff + Rs.489.99 interest on security deposit) has been credited in the Appellant's electricity account after giving security amount adjustment and category change benefit. Revised bill of Rs.(-) 5,780/- has already been issued.

4. The Appellant, in his rejoinder dated 14.11.2025, reaffirmed his contention as stated in the complaint. He emphasized issues of incorrect or manipulative billing, lack of transparency, miscommunication, and the undue harassment caused to him. Furthermore, he requested that the domestic category be treated as effective from 02.07.2025 (the date of the original application). Consequently, all adjustments/refunds should be granted with effect from 02.07.2025, as mentioned in the prayer.

5. The Forum, in its order dated 10.12.2025, observed that the first rejection of the application for category change was justified as inspection photographs taken on 04.07.2025 confirmed the absence of a domestic activity. However, second



inspection on 20.09.2025 established a valid domestic activity, therefore, no reason for further refusal to change the category. It was noted that the Respondent failed to comply with Regulation 17(5)(v) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, by neglecting to inform the consumer within the prescribed seven-day period regarding the status of the application. This caused undue harassment to the Appellant. Furthermore, the Forum found the adjustment of the security deposit (retaining Rs.2,700/- for the domestic connection and adjusting the Rs.10,800/- balance in the bill of October 2025) to be correct, it determined that the category change should have been made effective from the date of the second application, 28.08.2025, rather than 08.09.2025. Consequently, the Forum declined to grant additional compensation for harassment, a written apology, or an inquiry against officials due to a lack of regulatory provision and evidence.

Forum directed the Respondent to revise the bill effective from 28.08.2025 with all significant security adjustments and to pay a total compensation of Rs.4,300/- (Rs.2,200/- for 22 days @ Rs.100/day + Rs. 2,100/- for 21 days @ Rs.100/day) for the procedural delays as per Schedule-I of the DERC Regulations, 2017, in subsequent bill and implement order within 21 days .

6. The Appellant, dissatisfied by the order dated 10.12.2025, passed by the CGRF-TPDDL, has filed this appeal

He reiterated his stand and challenged the impugned order on the following grounds:

- **Violation of Natural Justice and Administrative Delay:** Because the Respondent failed to communicate any acceptance or rejection regarding the change of category within the prescribed timeframe, amounting to an arbitrary and unjustified delay that violates the principle of natural justice and statutory consumer protection rights.
- **Malafide and Selective Inspection:** Because the inspection conducted on 04.07.2025 was intentionally incomplete and biased. The inspecting official photographed only temporary carpentry activity while deliberately ignoring mainly residential areas connected to the same connection.
- **Illegal Tariff Application and Lack of Transparency:** Because the Respondent continued to apply a commercial tariff until 24.09.2025 despite domestic conditions being met earlier. Furthermore, the revision of bills (including the arbitrary figure of Rs.1,013/-) was done without a disclosed basis or explanation, violating standard billing regulations and transparency norms.



- **Improper Handling of Security Deposit:** Because the Respondent failed to adjust the security deposit (Rs. 5,130/-) in the bill dated 29.09.2025, necessitating multiple escalations and intervention at the CEO level, which demonstrates systemic negligence in financial accounting.
- **Grossly Inadequate Compensation:** Because the lower Forum's award of Rs. 4,300/- is disproportionate to the intensity of harassment, financial prejudice, and repeated regulatory violations suffered by the Appellant over a prolonged period.
- **Regulatory Misuse and Lack of Accountability:** Because the Respondent's reliance on Schedule-I to shield its officials from disciplinary action constitutes a systemic failure and regulatory misuse, leaving the consumer without adequate recourse while allowing official misconduct to go unaccounted.

The Appellant has prayed following:

- (i) To set-aside the arbitrary action, cancellation, notices and erroneous billing issued by TPDDL in relation to the Appellant's electricity connection.
- (ii) To treat the change of category from commercial to domestic as effective from 02.07.2025 (the date of original application) rather than any arbitrarily date fixed by TPDDL
- (iii) To issue a fully correct transparent bill after,: (a) recomputation of charges strictly under the Domestic tariff from 02.07.2025 onwards; (b) proper and complete adjustment/refund of excess amount charged under commercial tariff; (c) correct adjustment of the security deposit along with interest wherever applicable.
- (iv) To provide a detailed bill break-up, clearly explaining: (a) basis of slab-wise tariff application; (b) any revisions made to billed amounts (including unexplained figures such as Rs.1,013/-); (c) correct billing cycles applicable to the Appellant.
- (v) To pay adequate compensation over and above the nominal amount of Rs.4,300/- awarded by ECGRF, for: (a) prolonged mental harassment and intimidation; (b) unwarranted delay and repeated follow-ups; (c) financial prejudice caused by wrongful tariff application; (d) loss of time and inconvenience spanning several months.
- (vi) To direct initiation of disciplinary proceedings against concerned TPDDL officials, for: (a) threats and intimidation; (b) abuse of official position; (c)



deliberate suppression and manipulation of records; (d) non-compliance with Ombudsman and vigilance directions.

- (vii) To direct TPDDL to place on record the vigilance enquiry report, inspection report, internal communication, and system logs relevant to the Appellant's case, to ensure transparency and accountability.
- (viii) To direct TPDDL to ensure regular and timely billing, restore proper functioning of the TPDDL consumer's application/account, and prevent recurrence of discriminatory or complaint-driven billing practices.
- (ix) To pass any other order(s) as this Hon'ble Ombudsman may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice, equity, and consumer protection.

7. The Discom, in its written submission dated 27.01.2026 to the appeal, reiterated the facts that had been previously presented to the CGRF-TPDDL in response to the contention and prayer made in the appeal by the Appellant. The Discom denied all allegations, assertions, claims, and arguments put forth by the Appellant in the appeal. Furthermore, Respondent asserted that the impugned order issued by the CGRF contains no infirmities, except that the CGRF granted compensation to the Appellant, which should not have been awarded since the process concerning the notification had already been completed by the Respondent prior to the filing of the complaint with the CGRF. In addition, the CGRF admitted that the Respondent had addressed the Appellant's grievance at the ICGRC level but wrongly granted compensation, thus requesting the waiver of the compensation awarded by the CGRF. Moreover, the benefit of the category change was already given at the ICGRC level from 8<sup>th</sup> September 2025 (considering 7 working days from the date of registration of the request), indicating that the Appellant suffered no loss. Additionally, the CGRF had already provided a benefit to the Appellant with direction to consider the date of registration of the request, i.e. 28th August 2025, instead of 08.09.2025, and the benefit for that period has also been granted to the Appellant in compliance with the CGRF order. Furthermore, concerning notification no.2042243729, the case experienced delays due to an E-SLA error at IT, and after resolving this issue, it proceeded to the next stage for SVR on 15.09.2025 and reverted back to CWG on 21.09.2025. Case was further sent for reading updation on 22.09.2025. On 24.09.2025, the case was received from MRG/MRO with updated readings, and a demand note was generated on 24.09.2025, which was duly paid on 25.09.2025, and the request was closed on the same day.

Therefore, the initial request was cancelled based on the site report, which indicated that no domestic activity was found as renovation work was going on the site. This fact could be seen from the photographs placed on record about before



and after renovation work. However, after the closure of the first application, it is the Appellant who has taken time to convert his commercial premises into domestic use. Furthermore, the Appellant is attempting to merge another issue (Appeal no.29/2025) with the present appeal. This matter has already been resolved by the Hon'ble Ombudsman through a vigilance inquiry, the findings of which have been previously submitted to the Ombudsman. Besides that, no threats have been given to him by any personnel of TPDDL, as claimed by the Respondent.

8. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 06.03.2026. During the hearing, the Appellant was present with his spouse. Respondent (TPDDL) was represented by its authorized representatives. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases at length. Relevant questions were also asked by the Ombudsman as well as the Advisor, Secretary to elicit more information on the issue.

9. During the hearing, the Appellant reiterated the arguments, contentions, and prayer made before the CGRF and in the appeal. He asserted that the responses received from the Respondent were generated by the system rather than informing about persistent IT glitch. Despite sending an email with a photograph that demonstrated renovation work for domestic use, such as the kitchen etc., the Respondent claimed it was a commercial activity. Even after reapplying for a change of category on 28.08.2025, officials from TPDDL visited his premises on 30.08.2025 but for a vigilance inquiry regarding completion of compliance with another matter. The Appellant's spouse elaborated on the contentions as well as the ongoing billing discrepancies in revisions and adjustments, providing detailed explanations. The Appellant further argued that the compensation credit should be reflected in the subsequent bill. However, he was instructed to collect the cheque from the office of the Respondent, which was subsequently denied. After numerous follow-ups, similar to previous instances, his bill was now rightly revised to include the compensation amount credit and other adjustments pro-actively only prior to the current hearing.

10. In rebuttal, the officer representing the Respondent reiterated the arguments that were presented in the written submission to this office and the CGRF. In response to a query by the Ombudsman regarding the Appellant's application for a category change on 02.07.2025, and the site visit conducted on 04.07.2025 with photographic evidence, the officer was asked why the rejection or cancellation letter was not sent within 7 days as specified under Regulation 17 (5) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, instead of being sent on 31.07.2025. The Discom explained that there was an ESLA error in the system that specifically affected the category change requests of consumers during the period from 12<sup>th</sup> July 2025 to 15<sup>th</sup>



September 2025. However, the process of rectifying the error was underway with the IT and user group, during which testing and development occurred. To support the escalation of this matter to the IT department, an email detailing the period was submitted to the Ombudsman by the Respondent which was taken on record. However, the Advisor (Engineering) emphasized that this particular period (12th July to 15th September 2025) had not been previously mentioned in the written submission to the CGRF and the Ombudsman. Furthermore, the Ombudsman asked whether the Appellant had communicated in writing about the technical glitch or error, or if any response had been sent to the Appellant's email regarding this issue, the officer present was unable to provide a satisfactory answer.

The Secretary explained that the initial application was denied because no domestic activity was found during the site visit on 04.07.2025, however, the Appellant was not notified by the Respondent within a week's time regarding the acceptance or rejection of the application which is negligence on the part of the Respondent. There was no evidence placed on the record by the Respondent to indicate a technical glitch in the system. Furthermore, it is an admitted fact that after shifting to the premises on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, the Appellant re-applied for a category change on 28.08.2025. Nevertheless, a second site inspection was conducted following the intervention of the CEO on 20.09.2025. Hence, due to this undue delay, the Appellant was granted compensation by CGRF in accordance with Schedule - I of the DERC Supply Code, 2017.

Moreover, the Advisor (Engineering) pointed out that the Respondent has requested the waiver of the compensation awarded by the CGRF in their written submission to the appeal. Regarding the nature of the E-SLA error in IT, the following queries were made by the Advisor (Engineering): (i) Was it due to server downtime? (ii) Was there a workflow lock? (iii) Was there an auto-escalation failure? (iv) Was it an issue with portal access? If any of the aforementioned occurred, it should be documented, specifically including (i) system-generated error logs, (ii) date and time stamps, (iii) screenshot records (if available), and (iv) the IT helpdesk ticket number. However, the Respondent could not provide any reply. It was pointed out that the E-SLA error occurred from 12.07.2025, and the Respondent had sufficient time to issue a deficiency letter to the Appellant regarding the first application. Besides that, for the second application dated 28.08.2025, a site visit was not conducted after 15.09.2025 when IT glitch issue was completely resolved. The site was visited on 20.09.2025, after Appellant's escalation of the matter via email to the CEO on 18.09.2025. Furthermore, the Respondent's category was changed only on 25.09.2025. Additionally, numerous emails were exchanged between 31.07.2025 and 25.09.2025, and each time, only a system-generated response was sent to the Appellant. When the Appellant raised the issue, if there



was an E-SLA error, why did the Respondent failed to inform the Appellant via email or any mode about this error?

11. During the hearing, the Ombudsman emphasized that it is an admitted fact that during the initial site visit, no domestic activity was found. However, the Appellant was informed only on 31.07.2025. If there was an IT malfunction, he should have been notified as per prevailing Regulation 17 (5) (v) of DERC Supply Code, 2017. The second site visit took place on 20.09.2025, despite the rectification of the IT error was resolved on 15.09.2025. Furthermore, system-generated responses were issued in reply to several emails rather than addressing the technical glitch. Consequently, the Appellant experienced undue harassment. Additionally, the Forum's order was not complied within 21 days as specified in the regulations, and the Respondent's explanation for the delay in compliance is unconvincing.

12. Having taken all factors, written submissions and arguments into consideration, the following aspects emerge:

- (a) It is clear that Appellant submitted a request for category change for the first time on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2025, and by 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025, there had been no cancellation of the case nor any communication sent to the appellant. Moreover, Shri Sachin Kumar previously filed an appeal in this court under appeal no.29/2025, which was heard on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025. During the hearing, the Appellant referenced the category change case associated with the same address, and an order was issued in that appeal on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2025. Subsequently, a deficiency notice was dispatched to the Appellant, despite Regulation 17(5)(v) of the DERC Supply Code 2017 explicitly stating that 'in case change to such category is not permitted under any law in force, the Licensee shall inform the consumer within 7 (seven) days from the date of application'.
- (b) The appellant was compelled to escalate his complaint to the CEO of TPDDL on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2025 regarding the issue of category change for the second time. Besides that, numerous emails were sent by the appellant from 31<sup>st</sup> July 2025 to 25<sup>th</sup> September 2025. However, the customer care department provided a system-generated response instead of addressing it as an IT error or glitch.
- (c) The Respondent has indicated that there was an IT glitch or ESLA error from 12<sup>th</sup> July 2025 to 15<sup>th</sup> September 2025. Why did the IT department took an excessive time to rectify this issue? Consequently, the prolonged IT glitch is



not justifiable. Furthermore, the appellant's security deposit was also adjusted after persistent follow-ups, which was reflected in the bill with a due date of 27th October 2025.

(d) In light of the above, it is evident that the appellant has suffered undue harassment that could have been prevented.

13. In the light of the above, this court directs that the order of CGRF-TPDDL is modified as under:

- (i) The Respondent is hereby directed to pay a sum of Rs. 5,000/- (Rupees Five Thousand only) to the Appellant as compensation for the undue harassment and mental agony caused. This amount shall be adjusted in subsequent bill.
- (ii) The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is directed to conduct a thorough enquiry into the lapses identified in this matter. The enquiry should fix the responsibility and suggest systemic improvements to prevent repetition.
- (iii) A compliance report be submitted within 30 days from the receipt of this order.

14. This order of settlement of grievance in the appeal shall be complied within 15 days of the receipt of the certified copy or from the date it is uploaded on the website of this Court, whichever is earlier. The parties are informed that this order is final and binding, as per Regulation 65 of DERC's Notification dated 24.06.2024.

The case is disposed off accordingly.

  
(P.K. Bhardwaj)  
Electricity Ombudsman  
09.03.2026