

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. 15/2026

(Against the CGRF-BYPL's order dated 15.04.2026 passed in Complaint No.08/2026)

IN THE MATTER OF

Smt. Madhu Bala

Vs.

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

Present:

Appellant: Shri Vinod Kumar, Advocate, on behalf of the Appellant

Respondent: Shri Ravinder Singh Bisht, DGM (Legal), Ms Anita Sharma & Shri Nishant Chauhan, AM CMG, Ms Monika Sharma, Legal Retainer, Shri Ashok Kumar & Shri Rahul Saini, Advocates, on behalf of the BYPL

Date of Hearing: 21.07.2026

Date of Order: 23.07.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.15/2026 has been filed by Smt. Madhu Bala, W/o Shri Dinesh Kumar, R/o Kh. No.26/8/7, Ground Floor, Main Sewa Dham Road, Village Mandoli, Delhi - 110093, through Advocate, Shri Vinod Kumar, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Yamuna Power Limited (CGRF-BYPL)'s order dated 15.04.2026 passed in Complaint No.08/2026.

2. The background of the case presented before the Forum by the Appellant is that she purchased the property from Shri Shanti Lal Porwal on 09.09.2025, through a General Power of Attorney (GPA), wherein an electricity connection CA No. 150323835 of non-domestic category with a sanctioned load of 17 kW was already active in his name. She subsequently applied for a name change on the existing connection to her own name vide request no.OONNG2111256395 dated 21.11.2025. Despite submitting all the requisite documents, her application was



rejected by the Respondent, citing a reason "mismatch between applied address and billing address". However, she relied upon Regulation 17 (1) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, which specifies the rules governing the transfer of an existing connection. She contended that these rules make it mandatory for the licensee to process the name change once the ownership documents are submitted, and she had therefore requested the Forum to direct the Respondent to execute the name change as per the rules.

3. The Discom, in its written submission dated 29.01.2026 before the Forum, argued that the Appellant's name change application for CA No. 150323835 was rejected due to mismatch between address and meter's location. The Appellant's General Power of Attorney (GPA) mentioned the Property No. 26/8/7 but the Discom's official billing records only show the address as Kh. No. 26/8, G/F, Sewa Dham Road, Village Mandoli, Delhi - 110093, without any specific sub-division number. Furthermore, a Technical Feasibility (TF) site inspection revealed that the physical meter was installed on a portion of the divided plot that does not match the subdivided property description (26/7/8) claimed in the GPA. The Respondent asserted that the application for name change was rejected based on valid discrepancies as the billing address lacks a clear and verifiable property number and the meter's physical location does not align with the Appellant's documents of subdivided property. To proceed with the name change, the Discom stated that the Appellant must first follow standard procedures to officially correct the billing address with a specific property number and ensure the physical meter location matches her property.

4. The Appellant, in her rejoinder, countered the Respondent's objections by arguing that the subject electricity connection (CA No. 150323835) has been physically installed at the current premises for a long time and regular bills are being generated. Hence, no ambiguity or confusion exists regarding the actual supply address. She asserted that the Khasra Number is identical in all the property documents as well as in the Respondent's own records for that specific electricity connection, which proves that the connection belongs to the exact same premises rather than the other property. Furthermore, she submitted that she is ready to apply through a fresh application for any future address corrections or meter shifting. However, the current request for name change should not be hindered or obstructed, as it is strictly in accordance with Regulation 17 of the DERC Supply Code, 2017.

5. The Forum, in its order dated 15.04.2026, examined the Appellant's application for a change of name. During proceedings, the Appellant relied upon a



No Objection Certificate (NOC) executed by the erstwhile owner, Shri Shanti Lal Porwal. Through this NOC, the prior owner conveyed his consent to transfer the name of electricity connection to Smt. Madhu Bala. She had purchased 315 square yards portion of the property out of a total plot area measuring 1000 square yards via a GPA dated 09.09.2025. The Respondent, however, rejected the validity of the NOC, contending that the NOC strictly pertained to the connection in question located at the front portion of the plot. In contrast, the Appellant holds title and possession only over the rear portion of the premises.

The Forum noted a material mismatch regarding property identification. A distinct discrepancy was also observed regarding the physical location of the meter. Hence, the Forum held that the NOC from the erstwhile owner was ineffective as it cannot supersede the factual position regarding the location of the subject connection. Furthermore, Regulation 17 of the DERC Supply Code, 2017 was not applicable to the present facts. Ultimately, the Appellant failed to establish that the subject electricity connection corresponds to the specific premises owned or occupied by her. Thus, in view of the material discrepancies, the complaint stands dismissed, and the prayer for a name change was denied.

6. Being dissatisfied by the above-said order, the Appellant has preferred this appeal, reiterating the grounds previously stated before CGRF. The Appellant contended that the CGRF failed to appreciate the material facts on record. She further submitted that the Respondent's objections regarding billing and meter location are entirely unwarranted, given that the old connection continues to actively energize and supply the same subject property. Thus, the Appellant asserted that the arbitrary rejection of her name transfer request has caused undue harassment to her.

The Appellant has prayed the following:

- (a) To set-aside the impugned order dated 15.04.2026.
- (b) To direct the Respondent to change the name of connection in her name on the basis of the application bearing no.OONNG2111256395 in accordance with Regulation 17 of DERC Supply Code, 2017.
- (c) To restrain the Respondent from imposing any unnecessary conditions upon the Appellant.
- (d) To award compensation to the Appellant for undue harassment.



(e) To pass any other relief which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, and proper in the interest of justice.

7. The appeal was admitted on 07.05.2026.

8. The Respondent, in its written submission dated 22.05.2026 to the appeal, reiterated the facts as placed before the CGRF-BYPL. The Respondent refuted all the allegations and arguments put forth by the Appellant in the appeal. The Respondent submitted that there is no deficiency of service on the part of the Respondent, resulting in harassment to the Appellant or compensation rises, as the Appellant's request was declined due to material discrepancies and a failure to meet mandatory regulatory requirements. Citing Chapter - 1 Regulation 2(44) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, which defines "premises" based on the specific location of an installed or required meter, the Respondent contended that the Appellant has failed to establish a legal nexus and clear identity between the existing electricity connection (CA No. xxxx3835) and her claimed property no.26/8/7. Moreover, physical site verification and the Technical Feasibility Report confirmed that while the meter was installed originally on the front portion of the premises (undivided plot of 1000 square yards) at Khasra No. 26/8, the Appellant claimed ownership over a distinct, sub-divided rear portion of 315 square yards. The Respondent further argued that the Appellant has produced no official municipal records or lawful subdivision documents recognizing the alleged Property No. 26/8/7. Moreover, simply presenting a GPA, an NOC from the erstwhile consumer, or a similar Khasra neither establish the true identity of the Appellant's specific plot no.26/8/7, nor do they automatically entitle her to a transfer of the electricity connection. Respondent has acted legally and in strict compliance with the prevailing law. Hence, the request for name change of connection was rightfully and lawfully declined by the Respondent. The grounds raised by the Appellant in the present appeal are entirely vague, self-serving, misconceived, and completely contradicted by the material available on record.

9. The hearing was fixed on 15.07.2026 which later adjourned to 21.07.2026. During the hearing on 21.07.2026, both parties were represented by their authorized representative/advocates. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases at length and relevant questions were asked by the Ombudsman, Secretary & Advisor Engineering, to elicit more information on the issue.

10. During the hearing, the Advocate appearing for the Appellant reiterated the claims, arguments and prayers made in the appeal. In response to a query by the

AA

Ombudsman as to whether the Appellant possessed identical documents of address, the Advocate could not provide a satisfactory answer. He merely restated the existence of subject connection energized in 2012 and referring the constructed area on the site map of that connection, placed on record by the Respondent with the written submission. He reiterated the grievance for name change of that connection. Regarding the NOC from the erstwhile owner, the Advisor (Engineering) clarified that out of the original 1000 square yards plot in Khasra No. 26/8, Village Mandoli, Shri Shanti Lal Porwal had subsequently executed four separate GPAs showing plots as 26/8/1, 26/8/6, 26/8/5, and 26/8/7 (the Appellant's address), the Respondent released three new electricity connections in the year 2025. Hence, the said NOC cannot be taken into consideration in the present proceedings.

11. In rebuttal, the Advocate for the Respondent reiterated the arguments made in the written submission to the appeal.

12. During the hearing, the Ombudsman emphasized that the subject electricity connection (non-domestic category) was originally released for a 1000-square-yard plot at Khasra No. 26/8. In contrast, the GPA dated 21.11.2025 submitted by the Appellant covers only a 315-square-yard portion at Property No. 26/8/7. Pursuant to Regulation 17 of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, a valid electricity connection requires the address on the billing records to be identical to the address mentioned in the property ownership documents. Thus, due to this documentation mismatch, the request of the Appellant could not be allowed. However, the Appellant is at liberty to apply for a fresh electricity connection on the said premises (no.26/8/7) subject to completion of requisite commercial formalities as per prevailing regulations.

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

- (a) Perusal of records reveals that the original General Power of Attorney (GPA) was executed on 20.01.1992 between the first parties, (i) Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain and (ii) Mr. Sidh Prakash Jain, and the second party, erstwhile owner Mr. Shanti Lal Porwal, for a 1000 square yard land, out of Khasra No. 26/8, Village Mandoli, on the basis of which Shri Porwal got installed the subject electricity connection (CA No.XXXX3835) showing the same Khasra Number for which the appellant now seeks a name change.
- (b) A perusal of the site map corroborated the respondent's objection, as it shows that the electricity meter in question is located at the front side near

AA

the entrance gate, whereas the applied premises of the appellant is situated at the far back end side, creating a long distance from the metering position.

- (c) Regulation No 17(1) (i) of DERC supply Code 2017 (Transfer of existing connection) states, *"If any applicant wants transfer of connection due to any reason such as change of consumer's name due to change in ownership or occupancy of property, transfer to legal heir, etc. he shall apply to the Licensee in the prescribed format as notified in the Commission's Order,"*

Relevant part of 4th amendment of DERC Supply Code & Performance Standard Regulation 2019 in principle regulation 17 (i) of 2017 states as under.

Provided that in cases where the data has been received from the system of Sub-Registrar Office such as details of seller (name, CA number(s) etc.) and buyer's information (Name, email, mobile number) after the transfer of ownership of property in the name of new owner, the distribution licensee shall process transfer of connection without requirement of filing a separate request and additional documents.

- (d) Moreover, the appellant has failed to place on record any documents supporting her contention and her proposal made before the Forum, requesting that her name change be approved first, after which she would request to shift the meter from its far-distance location at the front of Khasra No. 26/8 to her rear location.
- (e) The NOC submitted by the erstwhile owner, Shri Shanti Lal Porwal, for the transfer of the subject connection into the name of the Appellant, is not recognized or covered anywhere under the provisions of the DERC Supply Code 2017.
- (f) It is observed that the name and address appearing in the billing records must be identical to those in the property ownership documents, whereas the property number in the instant matter submitted by the Appellant vary significantly from the original billing address.

AM

14. In the light of the above, this court upholds the order dated 15.04.2026 of CGRF-BYPL.

15. This order of settlement of grievance in the appeal shall be complied with 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 of accordingly.

Ali
23.7.2026
(Ali Zamin)
Electricity Ombudsman
23.07.2026