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. 13/2026
(Against the CGRF-TPPDL's order dated 10.02.2026 in CG. No.125/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

M/s Ozar Organic LLP
Through Authorized Representative Shri Nitin Lila

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)

Present:

Appellant: Shri Akash Godara, Counsel of the Appellant.

Respondent: Shri Harish Kundu, AGM-Legal, Shri Sachin Singhal & Shri Gaurav Gupta, Sr. Managers, on behalf of the TPDDL

Date of Hearing: 31.08.2026

Date of Order: 01.09.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.13/2026 has been filed by M/s Ozar Organic LLP through its Authorized Representative Shri Nitin Lila, Plot No.01(A), Sector-32, Pocket-1, Block-B, Rohini, Delhi - 110085, against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 10.02.2026 passed in CG No.125/2025.

2. The background of the case presented before the Forum by the Appellant is that he had applied for a new temporary electricity connection at the aforesaid premises, vide application no.2042104131 dated 14.08.2025. He contended that despite the timely completion and compliance of all requisite formalities and codal procedures, the Respondent summarily cancelled the said application without assigning any cogent reason. This act caused undue harassment to him. Thus, he approached the Forum seeking appropriate directions to the Respondent for immediate release of the requisite electricity connection.

3. The Discom, in its written submission dated 16.12.2025 before the Forum, contended that a site visit was conducted to check the feasibility for releasing the new connection. During this visit, it was found that the area of Sector-32, Rohini was unelectrified, with its electrification remained pending and in process. However, the specific issue of electrification of Pocket A-1, Sector-32, Rohini, has been challenged by the Heli Enclave Resident Welfare Association before the Hon'ble High Court vide W.P.(C) 10992/2022 and CM Appl. Nos. 32127/2022 and 55687/2022. Within those court proceedings, the Respondent had submitted that the DDA has paid the costs towards the electrification of the aforesaid area, except for the required space for the electric sub-station (ESS). However, that case was further listed for 22.01.2026 before the Court. The Discom made reference to Regulation 11(4)(iii)(e) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, which specifies the timeline for the completion of electrification in unelectrified areas and releasing new connections accordingly. Consequently, due to it being an unelectrified area, a new connection was not feasible in this area. The Discom stated that the requisite connection can only be released after the completion of the electrification work, subject to the availability of Right of Way (ROW) clearance of constraints from the Land Owing Agency and any other constraints beyond the control of the Discom.

4. Appellant, in its additional submission via e-mail dated 10.02.2026 presented before the Forum, stated that his actual electricity demand is approximately 800 to 900 kW. However, officials of TPDDL coerced him into applying for an unwarranted High Tension (HT) connection of 2,400 kW, under the pretext of preventing future inconvenience to prospective flat purchasers. Hence, the Appellant submitted that the sanctioned load is highly excessive and beyond his actual requirement of 800 - 900 KW. Furthermore, the Appellant highlighted a discrepancy regarding the installation of a temporary connection, stating that while he was compelled to deposit the demand note for a temporary meter of 150 kVA capacity, the physical meter installed at the site shows a capacity of only 108 kVA, which further restricts usage beyond 50 kVA.

5. During proceedings, the Forum noted that negotiations were ongoing between the parties to resolve the issue. Regarding the permanent electrification of the Complainant's site, the Respondent submitted that a scheme has been prepared and submitted to the DERC for approval. It was observed that the Respondent agreed to initiate the process of releasing a temporary connection upon issuing a demand note, subject to the Appellant submitting a consent/indemnity bond.

The Forum, in its order dated 10.02.2026, noted that a temporary electricity connection was released to the Appellant on 09.02.2026, which was restricted to a sanctioned load of 50 kW. The Respondent submitted that since the area is currently unelectrified, the connection had to be extended from a nearby network possessing limited capacity of 400 kVA. Thus, the 50 kW capacity limit was proposed by the Respondent and subsequently accepted by the Authorized Representative of the Appellant, who executed and submitted a formal Undertaking to this effect. In view of these circumstances, the Forum hereby directed the Respondent to initiate the implementation process in strict accordance with the prevailing regulations as and when the relevant scheme is approved by the DERC. Hence, Forum disposed of the matter being no further issue remains for adjudication.

6. The Appellant, dissatisfied by the order dated 10.02.2026 passed by the CGRF-TPDDL, has preferred this appeal. It is contended by the Appellant that he had applied for the release of a temporary electricity connection with a sanctioned load of 150 kVA. Despite issuing a demand note dated 30.01.2026 of Rs.16,53,770/-, including security deposit and other applicable charges, corresponding to the said load of 150 kVA and accepting the entire payment for the same, the Respondent arbitrarily restricted the electricity supply to only 50 kVA, subject to a condition of disconnection if usage is found to exceed this restricted limit. The Respondent justified this restriction on the grounds that the area in question is presently unelectrified and that the nearby network has limited capacity, meaning only 50 kVA could be temporarily provided. The Appellant argued that the Respondent cannot take advantage of its own infrastructural deficiencies and impose restrictions upon the consumer after accepting full payment. Furthermore, the Appellant relied on Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003, which explicitly casts a statutory obligation upon the distribution licensee to supply electricity to the premises of an applicant within the prescribed time, meaning any failure or refusal to provide supply in accordance with the sanctioned load amounts to a direct violation of this statutory duty.

The Appellant has further asserted that he had previously submitted an application bearing no. 2041927310, for which an application fee of Rs.1000/- had already been deposited. However, the Respondent completely ignored this earlier application and forced him to submit another application, thereby causing undue harassment to him. Under the latter application, while arbitrarily restricting the electricity supply, the Respondent allegedly forced the Appellant to execute an Undertaking cum Indemnification on a Rs.100/- stamp paper which was duly signed by him under compulsion and submitted to the Discom. In this undertaking, the Appellant was made to agree that in the event an electrification scheme is approved by the DERC, he would bear a portion of the cost of electrification, and that failure to comply with such conditions could result in the disconnection of his electricity supply, which the Respondent otherwise refused to release the electricity connection.

Appellant further contended that the CGRF failed to consider that his primary grievance was not merely the existence of an electrification scheme, but the illegal restriction imposed by the Respondent after collecting the full payment against the temporary connection. The Appellant submitted that the impugned order neither addresses the legality of the demand note issued by the Respondent nor examines the validity of the coercive undertaking obtained from him. Instead of adjudicating the dispute and granting relief to the consumer, the CGRF simply disposed of the complaint by directing the parties to wait for the approval of the electrification scheme by the DERC. The Appellant argued that the impugned order failed to protect the rights of the consumer and that the Respondent cannot be permitted to issue a demand note for a particular load, collect charges from him, and thereafter arbitrarily reduce the permissible load.

The Appellant has prayed following:

(i) To set-aside the impugned order dated 10.02.2026 of CGRF-TPDDL and direct the Respondent to provide the electricity supply to the Appellant with the sanctioned load of 150 kVA at the premises of the Appellant.

(ii) To direct the Respondent to remove the arbitrary restriction limiting electricity usage to 50 kVA and to refrain from imposing coercive or unilateral conditions upon the Appellant. The Hon'ble Ombudsman may also be pleased to declare the undertaking cum indemnification obtained by the Respondent from the Appellant as illegal and unenforceable.

(iii) To direct the Respondent to treat the earlier application bearing no.2041927310 as valid and to take appropriate action thereon in accordance with law.

(iv) Any other order or direction which the Ombudsman may deem fit and proper.

7. The Respondent, in its written submission dated 08.05.2026 to the appeal, reiterated the facts that had been previously presented to the CGRF-TPDDL. The Respondent denied all allegations, assertions, claims, and arguments put forth by the Appellant in the appeal. The Respondent asserted that the applied area is geographically unelectrified and lacks a formal electrification scheme; therefore, the Respondent is not duty-bound to provide electricity under DERC Regulations, as claimed by the Appellant. Although the Appellant initially applied for a 150 kVA load but found lack to sustain such a high individual load on the existing 400 kVA distribution transformer which would cause voltage fluctuations, transformer burnout, and a complete supply breakdown for nearby consumers. The Appellant

subsequently issued a letter dated 07.02.2026 to TPDDL, reducing their request to a 50 kVA load instead of 150 kVA. However, contrary to the Appellant's claim of a 50 kVA demand, the Respondent had already released a temporary load of 101/109 kW/kVA under CA No. 60035961006 using the nearby 400 kVA transformer. Following this 101/109 (kW/kVA) sanction, the transformer reached 87% of loading capacity, rendering it fully utilized and technically incapable of supporting any additional load. Concerning the issue of demand note, Respondent asserted that it was issued on 30.01.2026, explicitly subject to a mandatory technical feasibility clause, as paying a demand note in a zero-infrastructure, unelectrified zone does not allow the Respondent to bypass legal timelines or execution requirements. Consequently, any restriction on the remaining load is a physical necessity and a technical safeguard to prevent grid failure and protect peripheral network safety, rather than an arbitrary act or threat. Providing the full 150 kVA without dedicated infrastructure would actively violate safety norms under Central Electricity Authority (CEA) Regulations. Furthermore, the Respondent denied that the Appellant was forced, compelled, or pressured to sign any document; the execution of the undertaking-cum-indemnity bond is a standard, transparent regulatory requirement for developing areas, which the Appellant signed voluntarily to secure the immediate 101 kVA temporary supply. Proactively addressing the issue, the Respondent initiated a permanent solution for the Appellant's total requirement of 2400 kVA by framing a formal electrification scheme (Notification No. 2043362573) after a site visit on 16.01.2026. Because this scheme's value exceeds Rs.2.0 Crores, it has been submitted to the DERC for formal approval. Moreover, responding to the claim that the initial application (No. 2041927310) was ignored, the Respondent submitted that all applications are processed strictly by technical and regulatory feasibility; the second application was necessitated solely by the Appellant's own request to change the load or technical specifications, which could not be amended in the original filing, and Rs.1000/- application fee remains a non-refundable processing charge.

Furthermore, referring to Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003 by the Appellant, the Respondent admitted to the general statutory duty under that Section. However, it was submitted by the Respondent that this duty is not absolute. Instead, it remains conditional upon the provisions of the Act and the regulations framed thereunder. Respondent contended that the CGRF's decision constitutes a balanced and a legally valid order. CGRF rightly decided to dispose of the complaint with a direction to ensure implementation post-approval. The Respondent has prayed to the Ombudsman, (i) To dismiss the appeal and to uphold the CGRF's order. (ii) To uphold the technical constraints. (iii) To decline the earlier application because the current connection is already being processed under an active and valid application. (iv) To direct the Appellant to cooperate with the permanent new connection scheme that is currently pending before the DERC.

8. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 24.06.2026 which was adjourned to 08.07.2026. During the hearing on 08.07.2026, the Authorized Representative of the Appellant requested to grant a next date of hearing due to unavailability of his advocate. His request was accepted by the Ombudsman. Again on 21.07.2026, the Advocate of the Appellant requested to grant a next date of hearing via an e-mail. Hence, the next date of hearing was fixed for 06.08.2026 but on the same day before the hearing, the Appellant submitted via e-mail that due to heavy rainfall and water logging, he is not able to attend the court and requested to adjourn the matter for another date. Thus, the next date of hearing was fixed for 31.08.2026.

9. In the meantime, the Respondent has submitted an additional submission dated 20.08.2026 to this office with a copy to the Appellant, regarding developments that have occurred during the pendency of the present case. The same was taken on record.

10. During the hearing on 31.08.2026, both parties were present. 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 (Engineering), Secretary to elicit more information on the issue.

11. During the hearing, the Counsel for the Appellant reiterated the arguments, contentions, and prayer made in the appeal. He specifically pressed upon grievance regarding the actual demand of 800–900 kW. However, the Ombudsman clarified that the core issue remains the provision of a 150 kVA intended load, without any conditions restricting it to 50 kW. Additionally, the Advisor (Engineering) highlighted that a perusal of the consumption pattern indicated the load had not reached 109 kVA at any stage of operation.

12. In rebuttal, the officer present reiterated the arguments as in the written submissions. However, in response, he stated that they have already refunded the difference for the 50 kW additional security deposit to the Appellant, as shown in their additional submission dated 20.08.2026.

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

(a) The Appellant's application (vide notification no. 2042104131 dated 14.08.2025) for a 150 kVA long-term temporary connection for construction purposes was cancelled by the Discom due unelectrified area. It is observed that Rohini sector, plotted by the DDA, remained unelectrified due to DDA's failure to approach the utility (TPDDL), rendering the connection

Ah

non-feasible under Regulation 11 (4)(iii)(e) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017.

(b) However, following the intervention of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi in a writ petition filed by the RWA (*Heli Enclave Resident Welfare Association (Regd.) vs. Delhi Development Authority And Ors.*, W.P.(C)10992/2022 & CM Appl. Nos. 32127/2022, 55687/2022), the DDA deposited the electrification charges and earmarked space for an electrical sub-station (ESS) to TPDDL. Subsequently, the TPDDL framed a Scheme of Rs. 2.0 Crores for electrification to cater the load of 2400 kW permanently which is currently pending with DERC for its approval. Considering the fact that the area is unelectrified, the case has been processed for proper electrification in accordance with Regulation 21 of the DERC Supply Code, 2017.

(c) During the Forum proceedings, the Appellant submitted a notarized undertaking-cum-indemnity bond dated 29.01.2026, a consent letter to reduce the load to 108 kVA, and subsequent consent letters dated 07.02.2026 and 09.02.2026 carrying a rider to restrict the load to 50 kVA only. However, the Appellant submitted that the Undertaking was given under the compulsion of the Respondent.

(d) The Appellant's plea was that he had already deposited Rs.16,53,770/- against demand note dated 30.01.2026, including the security deposit and applicable charges, specifically for a 150 kVA load. : Despite the initial request and payment for the load of 150 KVA, a load of 109 kVA was sanctioned, with a specific rider restricting actual usage within a 50 kVA limit.

(e) Energization of the full 2400 KW load is aligned with Regulation 11(4)(e)(ii) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, but it will take time for HO/TO of ESS space, further to civil construction for an 11 KV ESS, HT Cabling, RMU installation, Metric Cubicle installation, and related works.

(f) There is no any proviso in DERC Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2017 and subsequent amendments, to obtain any undertaking / indemnity bond from the intended consumer to restrict load than demanded.

(g) Perusal of additional submissions dated 20.08.2026 of the Respondent reveal that Respondent has refunded differential of 50 kW additional security deposit, amounting to Rs.4,45,197.13 to the Appellant during the disposal of the appeal. However, it was not justified to hold this security amount without any reason when 150 kVA load was not released.

AK

(h) Moreover, it is observed that after release of subject connection on 09.02.2026, MDI is always < sanctioned load of 109 kVA so far.

14. In the light of the above, this court directs to modify the order of CGRF-TPDDL as under:

(i) Respondent is directed to pay the interest @ 6% per annum on Rs.4,45,197.13, calculated from the date the demand note was deposited until the date the amount was refunded to the Appellant. The amount of interest be adjusted to the ensuing bill.

(ii) Respondent's restriction of 50 kVA is null and void.

(iii) The compliance report be shared to this office within 30 days.

15. 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.

(Ali Zamin)
Electricity Ombudsman
01.09.2026