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. 25/2026
(Against the CGRF-TPPDL's order dated 14.11.2025 in CG.90/2025 & 91/2025 and dated 02.06.2026 in review case No.MA-6/91/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Bhuwan Chand
Proprietor of MB Offset

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)

Present:

Appellant: Shri Amit Kumar, son & Shri Manoj Gupta, advocate, on behalf of the Appellant.

Respondent: Shri Harish Kundu, AGM-Legal, Shri Sachin Singhal & Shri Kundan S. Rawat, Sr. Managers, and Shri Gaurav Sharma, Asst. Manager, on behalf of the TPDDL

Date of Hearing: 06.08.2026 & 31.08.2026

Date of Order: 01.09.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.25/2026 dated 08.06.2026 has been filed by Shri Bhuwan Chand, sole Proprietor of M/s MB Offset, B-64, Ground Floor, Phase - 2, Naraina Industrial Area, New Delhi - 110028, against the CGRF-TPPDL's order dated 14.11.2025 in CG.90/2025 & 91/2025 and dated 02.06.2026 in review case No.MA-6/91/2025 respectively, who authorized his son, Shri Amit Kumar, to represent the case.

2. The background of the case before the Forum was that the Appellant, in the capacity of a tenant of the premises and actual user of the connections, filed two separate complaints (registered under CG No. 90/2025 and CG No. 91/2025) before the Forum regarding two separate electricity connections of NDLT category.

MA

These connections, bearing CA No.60025469135 (CG No.90/2025) and CA No.60025427430 (CA No.91/2025), were installed at the First Floor and Ground Floor respectively of the subject premises in the name M/s Alfa Power Cable. The Appellant challenged two highly inflated, baseless, impugned electricity bills raised in the month of April, 2025 by the Respondent. Explicitly, against CA No. xxxxx9135 (First Floor), the Respondent raised an exorbitant bill of Rs.12,19,080.00, which illegally mentioned arrears of Rs.6,98,809.58 alongwith LPSC of Rs.5,24,774.23, and an adjustment of Rs.75,460.00. Simultaneously, against CA No. xxxxx7430 (Ground Floor), an inflated impugned bill of Rs.22,12,490.00 was issued, consisting of arrears amounting to Rs.16,59,347.59 alongwith LPSC of Rs.6,30,282.05, and an adjustment of Rs.1,38,207.00. He sought rectification in both bills through 100% waiver of the LPSC & other illegal assessment charges in the month of September 2022. Since both complaints were identical in nature and sought the same relief, the Forum joined them together.

The Forum passed an order on 14.11.2025 in which removed 100 % LPSC for the first connection CA No.xxxxx9135 under CG No. 90/2025 and ordered a fresh bill to be made. However under CG No.91/2025, only 50 % waiver of LPSC amount was given for the second Connection CA No.xxxxx7430. Both cases were disposed off. Resultantly, the Appellant is aggrieved with the said CGRF's order regarding the revision of bill without removal of 100% LPSC against second connection under CG No. 91/2025. Therefore, his instant appeal is only about the remaining impugned bill of Rs.22,12,490.00 for CA No.xxxxx7430.

Before the Forum, the Appellant submitted that, being the user of the electricity connection and tenant of Registered Consumer, Shri Pramod Kumar Chanana, he is not a party to the ongoing legal disputes between the registered consumer and the Respondent. Respondent unfairly issued an exorbitant baseless bill with heavy LPSC despite that he is not at fault and could not be held liable for these disputed charges. Additionally, the Respondent disconnected his electricity supply on 29.04.2025 without any lawful justification. This arbitrary action of disconnection has caused undue mental harassment and financial loss.

3. The Discom, in its written submissions before the Forum, pointed out that the electricity connection CA No.xxxxx7430 is registered in the name of M/s Alfa Power Cable, whereas the supply is being used by M/s MB Offset. However, the Appellant has not placed on record any tenancy document of the premises. Respondent asserted that the consumer has made part payments rather than regular payments of the electricity bills since February, 2021. As a result of this non-payment of dues, the outstanding amount accumulated to Rs.22,53,340/- including LPSC. Regarding the pending legal dispute/civil suit filed in 2020 before Patiala House Court, it was mentioned that the Court, in its order dated 21.03.2025, dismissed the said suit in

default for non-appearance and non-prosecution by the Plaintiff, Ms. Nisha Chanana, w/o Shri Pramod Chanana, who filed the civil suit for permanent & mandatory injunction with prayer to restrain defendant company from disconnecting connections including subject connection CA No.xxxxx7430, and transfer the connection on other name. Thereafter, the disconnection notice dated 31.03.2025 under Section 56 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the subject connection was served to the consumer with respect to a bill demand of Rs.22,57,938.00 for the month of March, 2025, leading to the disconnection of the electricity supply on 29.04.2025.

The Respondent further asserted that the Appellant/consumer is himself liable for the disconnection of supply and the consequent loss, as he is under a legal obligation to make the payment of dues irrespective of any ongoing dispute. Raising issues related to the year 2022 in the present proceedings merely shows that these matters are being brought up now to justify his own default in making payments. The Respondent submitted that there is no irregularity on their part and that the consumer is simply trying to avoid his financial liabilities or avail the benefit of LPSC. However, pursuant to the interim direction dated 15.07.2025 of the Forum, the consumer made a payment of Rs.8,02,000/-, which constitutes 50% of the principal amount of Rs.16,03,551.23, on 21.07.2025. Thus, the electricity supply of the subject connection was successfully restored on 23.07.2025.

4. However, in support of the contention, the additional written submission filed via e-mail dated 08.10.2025 by the Appellant was also placed on record.

5. The Forum, in its order vide CG 91/2025 for CA No.60025427430, observed that the Respondent failed to separate current charges from the stayed/disputed bill, continuously issuing both bills instead of kept the contested dues to the NTA head, as established by the TPDDL bills issued between 2022 and 2025. Moreover, Respondent conduct of not issuing bills only on current demand amounts to violation of the stay order and unfair treatment to consumer as it issued the bills on whole including stayed amount.

The Forum noted that the Appellant has been making partial and irregular bill payments. Because of these irregular payments, a full waiver of the LPSC cannot be given. However, Respondent was directed to calculate the LPSC on the remaining principal amount after adjusting all partial payments already made by the Appellant for the period from the date of the Court order i.e. 21.03.2025 to the date the complaint was filed with the ICGRC (No. ICG25-261657) on 03.06.2025. The Forum decided that waiver of 50% of LPSC amount so calculated was given in the light of facts as narrated above. Hence,Forum directed the Respondent to issue a final bill with 50% of LPSC amount alongwith remaining principal amount to the

Appellant. The Appellant has liberty to pay the bill in two installments. The first installment was to be paid on or before 10.12.2025 and second installment on or before 01.01.2026.

6. Aggrieved by the order dated 14.11.2025, the Appellant filed a review petition under MA-6/91/2025, contending that complaints CG No. 90/2025 and 91/2025 were based on identical facts, parameters, and billing disputes. He argued that the Forum inadvertently disallowed his prayer to grant the same relief in CG No. 91/2025 (CA No. 60025427430). Thus, the Appellant sought review/modification of the order to get parity with CG No. 90/2025, along with an interim stay against the disconnection of supply of CA No. xxxxx7430 till the pendency of the petition.

7. The Forum, in its review order dated 02.06.2026, dismissed the review petition as non-maintainable, ruling that no valid grounds for review existed under the regulations. The Forum clarified that identical relief was denied due to lack of parity in payments made by the Appellant in both connections. A complete LPSC waiver was granted in CG No. 90/2025 because regular current bills were paid in full, whereas only a partial waiver was justified in CG No.91/2025 due to his numerous times part-payments against current bills.

8. The Appellant, dissatisfied by the order dated 14.11.2025 & review order dated 02.06.2026, has preferred this appeal through his son Shri Amit Kumar to represent the case. He submitted that recently a disconnection notice for an outstanding balance of Rs. 15 lakhs, which includes Rs. 7 lakhs as LPSC was received from the Respondent. Regarding non-payment of outstanding dues, he expressed severe financial hardship due to substantial business losses that resulted in his inability to make timely payments on regular electricity bills. He contended that electricity is an absolute necessity for his daily business survival, hence, requested a formal stay on the disconnection notice until the disposal of instant appeal.

The Appellant has prayed the following:

(i) To waive off the LPSC accumulated on his account to reduce the heavy financial burden

(ii) To allow him to clear the remaining principal balance in 3 to 4 monthly installments.

9. The Appeal was admitted on 11.06.2026. The Ombudsman has allowed a stay, vide letter dated 11.06.2026, on the disconnection of electricity connection CA

No.60025427430 (RC - M/s Alfa Power Cable) till the disposal of appeal, subject to the Appellant regularly paying the current monthly charges.

10. The Respondent, in its written submission to the appeal, reiterated the facts that had been previously presented to the CGRF-TPDDL. Respondent asserted that the Forum's final ruling in Case No. 90/2025 fully considered the different payment histories of both connections before deciding on the Respondent's claim of lack of parity. The decision to refuse a 100% LPSC waiver for the defaulting ground floor connection was entirely well-reasoned and justified, particularly given that the Appellant is a habitual and persistent defaulter in payments. Respondent further asserted that despite receiving a generous interim reduction of 50% on the LPSC, as granted by the CGRF in its final order, the Appellant failed to pay the revised bills. Hence, the disconnection executed on 29.04.2025 was entirely valid, lawful, and a direct consequence of the Appellant's ongoing defaults.

Regarding the accuracy of the revised bill, the Respondent indicated that a credit amount of Rs.35,688/- (50% LPSC waiver for the period from 21.03.2025 to 03.06.2025) was adjusted to the Appellant's electricity account, resulting in a payable amount of Rs.14,78,907.18 as of 05.12.2025. This credit amount was reflected in the subsequent bill dated 02.01.2026, which totaled Rs.15,48,050.00, including the current demand. However, the Appellant failed to pay the revised bill, leading to a total outstanding dues of Rs.16,35,010.00 as of June 2026. Furthermore, since the Appellant has not made any payments for consumption charges since 2021, including the revised bill as per the CGRF's order dated 14.11.2025, LPSC has been levied to the defaulted amount in accordance with Regulation 42 'Recovery of Arrears' of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, which remains payable by the Appellant. Therefore, the consumption bill against CA No.xxxxx7430 is correct and payable by the Appellant.

11. The date of hearing was fixed on 06.08.2026. During the hearing, both parties were present. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases at length. Relevant questions were also asked by the Ombudsman, Secretary & Advisor (Engineering), to elicit more information on the issue.

12. During the hearing on 06.08.2026, son appearing for the Appellant reiterated the claim of financial hardships due to Covid pandemic, resulted in his inability to pay regular bills timely. He took all efforts in this regard but gone in vain. He requested to waive of 100% LPSC for clearing the principal amount as soon as possible. However, only one installment is left to pay.

AN

13. In rebuttal, the officer representing the Respondent reiterated the arguments that were presented in the written submission to this office. In response to a query by the Ombudsman, the Respondent submitted that outstanding dues are reflected consistently on bills during 2022 to 2025. Nevertheless, the Advisor (Engineering) highlighted that the actual payment history record fails to support the Respondent's claim of habitual default; rather, the history reveals that the Appellant defaulted on only two specific occasions. The Advisor (Engineering) sought clarifications on: (i) whether the current demand and the disputed amount under the NTA head have been consistently and regularly reflected in the bills between 2022 and 2025; (ii) the exact balance amount kept under the NTA head by the Respondent after deducting part-payments made by the Appellant pursuant to the Patiala House Court order dated 21.03.2025; and (iii) the availability of documentary evidence proving receipt of the disconnection notice served upon the Appellant under Section 56(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Respondent could not provide any reply on these points and requested to grant 07 days' time to file a detailed written submission. The request was allowed, and the matter was accordingly listed for the next date of hearing on 31.08.2026.

14. In compliance with the above direction, the Respondent has submitted the reply dated 20.08.2026 alongwith copy of Notice dated 31.03.2026 regarding disconnection under Section 56 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003, which was taken on record.

15. During hearing on 31.08.2026, both parties were present.

16. During the hearing, in response to the queries raised by the Ombudsman on 06.08.2026, the officer present reiterated the position detailed in their additional submission dated 20.08.2026. He stated that the Appellant's conduct of making partial payments led to the accumulation of outstanding dues, including LPSC. In response, the Advisor (Engineering) asked how these partial payments were accepted as there is no provision under the regulations to receive partial payments for any bill since the bills are non-editable. The officer explained that the Appellant made these partial payments via NEFT and net banking, which facilitate the payer to modify the transaction amount. However, this explanation could not convince him. Further, it was emphasized that no outstanding dues existed on the disputed CA No. 60025427430 when the petition was originally filed in the Patiala Court on 23.01.2020. To revise the bill, the officer was directed to submit the exact amount of total outstanding dues, including LPSC, as on date.

17. During the hearing, in response to a query by the Ombudsman as to why payments were not made regularly between 2020 and 2023, the Appellant reiterated his financial inability. He apprised the Ombudsman that during the

COVID-19 pandemic in the years 2020–2021, he faced severe hardships in running his business, which resulted in a financial crunch. Following that period, his father was hospitalized in a critical condition. The entire cost of the medical treatment exhausted his savings, forcing him to rely on loans to survive. However, he stated that once his business conditions improved, he started making regular partial payments every month. He requested the Ombudsman to consider his prayer in the light of his difficult financial condition and promised to make regular payments in the future.

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

(a) Perusal of records reveal that when petition was filed in Court on 23.01.2020, at that time there was outstanding dues amounting to Rs.93,000/- against the disputed CA No.60025427430.

(b) Petitioner (Ms. Nisha Chanana) had prayed before the Patiala House Courts to restrain the defendant no.1 (Discom) from disconnecting and transferring the user name of CA nos. (i) CA No.60025427430 & CA No.60025469135 in the name of Company Alfa Power Cable (subject connection) (ii) CA No.60025469135 in the name of M/s Alfa Power Cables C/o Mr. Pramod Kumar Channa to in the name of Defendant No.2 - Mr Amarnath (father of Shri Pramod Kumar Channa).

(c) Earlier CA No.60012289471 was energized on 07.01.2022 in the name of Shri Amar Nath for which name change was applied. Final bill was generated of this connection billing date 09.08.2018. In the payment history, payment of this CA was regular.

(d) CA No.60025427430 was allotted in the name of Company ALFA Power Cable w.e.f. 08.08.2019 in lieu of CA No.xxxx9470 and payment history of CA No.xxxx7430 shows regular payments from 27.09.2019 to 27.02.2020. First time arrears of Rs.60,699.31 were reflected in May 2020 billing cycle. However, further payments from June 2020 to November 2022 were not regular as some parts payments were made in between period.

(e) From December 2022 to August 2023, no payment was made and from September 23 upto August 2026, regular part payments are being made. Consequently, too much amount been accumulated.

(f) The breakup of duplicate bill dated 01.08.2026 states total amount payable of Rs.8,94,420/- (net current demand of Rs.44,647.32 + arrears of

AU

Rs.2,78,244.25 & Rs.9500/- (-) Adjustment Rs.254816.00 + LPSC Rs.8,16,847.82).

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

(a) Respondent will raise the bill within three days of this order / uploading on website on actual consumption basis after downloading of present meter reading & ensure delivery of bill to the Appellant, giving 15 days time of payment.

(b) In the raised as above at (a), 80% LPSC is waived off out of whole LPSC.

(c) Appellant will make the payment of payable amount in one go within 15 days of receipt of bill.

(d) Compliance report of order be submitted with 30 days of this order.

20. 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