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. 26/2026
(Against the CGRF-BYPL's order dated 25.05.2026 passed in Complaint No.237/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

Smt. Paramjeet Kaur & Ors.

Vs.

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

Present:

Appellant: Shri Bharat Rajput & Shri Vinod Kumar, Advocate, on behalf of the Appellants.

Respondent: Shri Ravinder Singh Bisht, DGM (Legal), Ms Vijay Michael, DGM (Accounts), Ms Monika Sharma, Legal Retainer, Shri Akash Swami, Advocate, on behalf of the BYPL.

Date of Hearing: 15.09.2026

Date of Order: 17.09.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.26/2026 dated 22.06.2026 has been filed by Ms. Paramjeet Kaur & Ors. (Ms Beenu Rajput, Shri Bharat Rajput, Ms Sonia Sharma & Shri Praveen Rajput) through Advocate, Shri Vinod Kumar, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Yamuna Power Limited (CGRF-BYPL)'s order dated 25.05.2026 passed in Complaint No.237/2025 in the matter of Sarla Sharma & Others vs. BYPL.

2. The background of the case before the Forum was that, originally, Smt. Sarla Sharma & Ors. (total of 11 complainants, including the five Appellants who were affected consumers of their respective connections) had filed a joint complaint before the Forum. They sought the waiver of outstanding dues amounting to Rs. 4,46,665/-, which had been transferred by the Respondent from a disconnected connection (CA No. 101266629, domestic category) in the name of Smt. Pushpa Devi to their live connections. The Appellants claimed to be the owners of their

AW

respective portions of the property located at House No. 1/9721, Khasra No. 347, Gali No. 4 & 5, West Rohtash Nagar, Shahdara, Delhi. They also requested the Respondent to furnish the records of the disconnected connection.

The stand of the Respondent before the Forum was that the Appellants were seeking a waiver of transferred electricity dues totaling Rs. 4,46,665/-, pertaining to CA No. 101266629 (Registered Consumer: Smt. Pushpa Devi). This connection was installed on 21.05.1995 at the premises bearing No. 1/9721-A, Bahal Gali, Rohtas Nagar, Shahdara, Delhi - 110032, and the dues were subsequently transferred to their respective live connections.

The Respondent argued that payment for the disputed connection was received from the consumer only up to 31.03.2014. The meter regularly recorded consumption until 19.01.2018. Due to the non-payment of electricity dues, the meter was removed on 11.03.2018 with outstanding dues of Rs.3,14,165.79 at a final reading of 49927 units. However, the consumer billing was running till 2022. The site inspections conducted on 26.06.2024 and 20.09.2024 revealed that the old meter and its cables had been removed, and the same property had been sub-divided into three parts, consisting eleven live connections, as detailed hereunder:

(a) Part A - consisting of four floors and four connections

(b) Part B - consisting of five floors and five connections

(c) Part C - consisting of two floors and two connections

Name / CA No of Part A Connections with address	DOE	Name / CA No of Part B Connections with address	DOE	Name / CA No of Part C Connections with address	DOE
Ms. Sarla Sharma 101298331 H.No 347/1/9721 Near Gorakh Park, Delhi	04.07.1996	Ms. Paramjeet Kaur 153410349, 9721-B GF , PARKING Gali No 4 & 5 Behal Gali No-4, West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	23.08.2021	Mr. Vimal Pal 154117513,1/9721-C, 1/9721-B , 1st F, Gali No-4 , West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.04.2023
Sarla Devi Sharma 150070910, 1/9721, 1st Floor, Behal Gali No-4, West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.05.2011	Ms. Beenu Rajput 152866169, 1/9721-B,3rd F, Kh No. 347, Behal Gali No-4&5 West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.07.2019	154520626, 1/971 -C, GF,Behal Gali No-4 , West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	13.08.2024

Name / CA No of Part A Connections with address	DOE	Name / CA No of Part B Connections with address	DOE
Vinod Kumar 103761213, 1/9721 2nd Floor, Kh No. 347, Behal Gali No-4, West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi.	19.4.2011	Sh Bharat Rajput 152866170,1/9721-B,UGF Behal Gali No-4&5 West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.07.2019
Harsh Vardhan 103761239, 1/9721, T/F, Kh No 347 Behal Gali No-4, West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.4.2011	Ms. Sonia Sharma 154127161, 1/9721-B, 1st F, Behal Gali No-4-Y West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	21.04.2023
		Mr Praveen Rajput 152866171, 1/9721-B, 2nd F, Behal Gali No-4&5 West Rohtash Nagar, Delhi	19.7.2019

Consequently, dues transfer notices dated 23.09.2024 were served to all eleven consumers via speed post. The Respondent justified the transfer of dues from the disconnected connection to all active electricity connections by invoking Regulation 52 (3) *'Prevention of Unauthorized Reconnection'* of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, which empowers the Respondent to undertake such an exercise. The Respondent maintained that it is legally entitled to recover its outstanding dues, a position that has been upheld by several judgments passed by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and various other courts.

However, during the proceedings, the Respondent filed settlement letters for six out of the eleven connections, under which the outstanding dues were withdrawn by the Respondent. Consequently, the total dues of Rs. 4,46,665/- were transferred to the remaining five connections, as per the details provided hereunder

S.No.	Registered Consumer	CA No.
(1)	Smt. Paramjeet Kaur	153410349
(2)	Ms Beenu Rajput	152866169
(3)	Shri Bharat Rajput	152866170

(4) Ms Sonia Sharma 154127161

(5) Shri Praveen Rajput 152886171

In their amended complaint of January 2026, the Appellants sought the withdrawal of the transferred dues from the disconnected connection (CA No. 101266629) to the aforesaid live five connections, arguing that they were not liable for the payment.

3. The Forum, in its order dated 25.05.2026, rejected the complaint as it did not find any illegality or arbitrariness in the action of the Respondent in retaining the transferred dues against the remaining five live connections. It was observed that the Respondent had rightly transferred the outstanding dues of the disconnected connection (CA No. 101266629 in the name of Smt. Pushpa Devi) to the active connections (five) at the property no. 1/9721 by invoking Regulation 52 (3) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017. Although the Respondent initially transferred these dues among eleven active connections but it subsequently withdrew the dues from six connections following site verification, keeping the dues transferred on only five connections. It was further observed that the Respondent had placed on record that the original disconnected connection belonged to this exact property, which was later sub-divided into three portions (Part A, B, and C) where the current active connections exist. Conversely, the Appellants failed to produce any documentary proof to establish that their five live connections pertained to entirely separate, independent, and unrelated premises from the original plot where the unpaid bills/arrears pertained.

The Forum directed the Respondent to ensure that the dues were correctly apportioned only to the connections which were actually found existing at the premises related to the disconnected subject connection. The Respondent was also directed to waive the entire LPSC from the transferred dues and allow the Appellants easy installments to clear the transferred dues along with the payment of current dues, if they so requested.

4. Aggrieved by the above-said CGRF-BYPL order, the Appellants have preferred this appeal on the following grounds:

(a) The Forum ignored the fact that the Appellant had filed the property chain documents which establish that the disconnected connection does not pertain to their premises of Part B. Moreover, the Statement of Account, filed by the Respondent before the CGRF, shows that regular bill

AK

payments were stopped in March 2014, yet electricity was continuously consumed until March 2018. Despite this, the Respondent neither disconnected the electricity supply nor raised any demand for the said dues while releasing five new connections to the Appellants during 2019 - 2021. Therefore, the subsequent transfer of these old outstanding dues to the Appellants' electricity account is completely unjustified. Moreover, the onus was upon the Respondent to prove its version concerning the deficiency in service.

(b) Records from the K. No. file show that the disconnected connection was installed in 1990. However, Smt. Pushpa Devi already held the property ownership documents (GPA) from 1988. She misrepresented her status by claiming to be a tenant to get the connection in her name. This clearly proves that the connection was never actually installed on the Appellants' premises.

(c) The CGRF ignored the Appellants' requests seeking a direction to the Respondent to produce essential evidence, specifically the Lab Report and PD Punch Form of the disconnected connection, in question.

The Appellants have prayed the following:

(a) To set-aside the impugned order dated 25.05.2026.

(b) To direct the Respondent to withdraw the transfer of outstanding dues to the Appellants in respect of their five active connections registered in the names of the Appellants, namely: (1) Ms. Paramjeet Kaur (CA No. 153410349), (2) Ms. Beenu Rajput (CA No. 152866169), (3) Shri Bharat Rajput (CA No. 152866170), (4) Ms. Sonia Sharma (CA No. 154127161), and (5) Shri Praveen Rajput (CA No. 152866171).

(c) To award compensation to the Appellants for undue harassment.

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

5. The appeal was admitted on 02.07.2026.

AK

6. The Respondent, in its written submission dated 11.08.2026 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 contended that the Appellants' property documents do not bind the adjudicating authority to accept their interpretation. This alleged title chain failed to prove that the five live connections are on a separate property. The original disconnected connection (CA No. 101266629- RC Smt. Pushpa Devi) was installed at the exact same premises. Also, releasing new connections between 2019 and 2021 does not extinguish past liabilities. It does not create an estoppel or a waiver against the Respondent. Non-transfer of dues at the initial stage does not bar subsequent recovery. The site inspections in the year 2024 conclusively proved that all connections exist on the same original premises. This fully justifies the dues-transfer action. Furthermore, the original consumer Smt. Pushpa Devi's status as a tenant is irrelevant. Electricity connections are issued to owners, occupiers, or tenants similarly. Her tenant status does not prove the connection was installed elsewhere.

Furthermore, regarding reliance on laboratory report, Respondent submitted that this dispute is about recovering of outstanding dues. It is not about a defective or tampered meter. Therefore, a laboratory report or PD Punch Form is not the foundation of this action. Instead, the transfer was based upon commercial records, the verified disconnection, the outstanding dues, and the site inspections conducted by the Respondent. Regarding the statement of account, it clearly proves the payment default and accumulation of outstanding dues. These figures are not invalidated just because consumption entries continued until the physical removal of the meter. The Respondent placed all relevant records on file and discharged its burden of proof. The onus then shifted to the Appellants to produce cogent evidence showing that their live connections pertained to the independent premises. Thus, the Appellants' allegations of a deficiency in service remain vague. They have not pointed out any specific statutory violation. Instead, they used selective documents and self-styled property numbers. This is a calculated attempt to create an illusion of separate properties where no physical separation exists.

7. The hearing was fixed and held on 15.09.2026. 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.

8. During the course of the hearing, the Advocate appearing for the Appellant reiterated the claims, arguments, and prayers set forth in the appeal memo. He contended that the Appellants had purchased the subject premises during the period 2019–2021, subsequent to which new permanent electricity connections were installed at their premises designated as Part-B with initial "zero" readings. At the time of purchasing the property and subsequently obtaining the new connections, no outstanding dues were raised or notified by the Respondent. It was argued that if such liabilities had been reflected at that time, the Appellants could have forced the builder to pay those dues. However, raising demand notices at the belated stage in 2024 is legally impermissible. The Appellant contended that the alleged dues are strictly time-barred and not recoverable under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003. The Appellant further questioned the Respondent's failure to mitigate the accumulation of dues, noting that while payments apparently stopped in March 2014, the Respondent permitted the continuous consumption of electricity instead of disconnecting the supply, until the physical removal of the meter in March 2018. The Appellant argued that the connection ought to have been disconnected immediately upon default rather than allowing liabilities to build up over several years.

In response to a specific query raised by the Ombudsman regarding ambiguity in the division of the subject premises, the Advocate clarified that the complete property chain documents had already been submitted in support of their contentions before the CGRF. A perusal of these submitted records confirms that the premises, bearing Property No. 1/9721-B, forming part of Khasra No. 347, has maintained its distinct identity as "Part-B" since 1988. The Appellant strongly rejected the Respondent's assertion that this was a self-styled property number, emphasizing that the property chain elaborately and conclusively establishes the Appellant's premises as a separate, independent, and distinguished identity.

9. In rebuttal, the Advocate appearing for the Respondent reiterated the arguments and contentions set forth in their written submission to the appeal. During the proceedings, the Ombudsman emphasized that a perusal of the records reveals the subject property was originally a single plot of 150 sq. yards, which appears to have been subsequently sub-divided into three distinct portions, namely Part-A, Part-B, and Part-C. The disconnected connection in question was installed way back on 21.05.1995 in the name of Smt. Pushpa Devi at premises no. 1/9721-A. However, it was observed that the title documents of Smt. Pushpa Devi do not contain the letter "A". When queried by the Ombudsman as to how the suffix "A" was added to the billing address when the same was not mentioned in the title documents on record, the officer present failed to provide a convincing response.

The officer merely submitted that the K. No. file of the old connection contained a rent receipt mentioning the address as Property No. 1/9721-A, suggesting that the suffix might have been added on the basis of that receipt. The Ombudsman noted that in the absence of a registered rent agreement, such an addition in the billing records solely on the basis of a rent receipt was questionable.

The Respondent was further questioned by the Ombudsman as to why, after bill payments completely stopped in 2014, consumption from the defaulting connection was allowed to continue uninterruptedly until the physical removal of the meter in the year 2018, and moreover, why the billing continued running till 2022. It was pointed out that this operational failure on the part of the Respondent directly resulted in the accumulation of huge outstanding dues that could have otherwise been restricted or curtailed. In response, the Respondent admitted the fact that the connection was not disconnected in a timely manner and that the meter was removed at a belated stage. However, the Respondent maintained that the outstanding dues strictly pertained to CA No. 10126629, arguing that the dues were rightly transferred and remain payable by the Appellants. Furthermore, when queried by the Advisor (Engineering) regarding the basis under which the alleged dues were previously withdrawn from two other connections installed at Part-C, the Respondent could not provide any convincing or justified response.

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

(a) Perusal of records reveals that Ms Pushpa Devi has purchased property bearing H No.1/9721, Behal Gali, Subhash Park, 150 Sq. Yards area consisting of two rooms, kitchen & bath room etc. out of Kh No. 347 on 23.02.1988. However, the same property has been sub divided into three parts i.e. Part A , B & C, where multiple connections were installed by the Respondent.

(b) It establishes that after sub-division of original property in three parts all 11 nos. connections were released in part A, B & C. Out of which 4 connections of Part A were released before removal of connection of Ms Pushpa Devi on 11.03.2018 due to non-payment of dues. Thus, withdrawal of dues transferred by Respondent is justified. However, transferred dues withdrawal of two connections of Part C is not justified. Moreover, dues transferred on five connections of part B are justified, which is in accordance with Proviso of Regulation 52(3) of

DERC Supply Code, 2017. In all these connections of part B & C, Khasra Number & address are same as of Ms Pushpa Devi, having only difference of putting suffix 4 & 5 / B / C after 1/9721 , Behal Gali, Subhash Park.

(c) It is observed that payment defaulter connection, in question, was removed on 11.03.2018 with due amount of Rs.3,14,165.79, being treated as Temporary disconnection (TD), which was never restored and later will be treated as permanent connection (PD). As per Sub Regulation 19 (6) of DERC Order Dated 24.09.2018 (Removal of Difficulties) that during TD, fixed charges are to be chargeable & connection becomes dormant after six month of disconnection/removal of meter. Thus, from 11.03.18 to 10.09.2018 only fixed charges are recoverable. On the other hand the Respondent continued raising bills till June-2022 billing cycle. Hence, the amount swelled to Rs.4,46,655/-, which is not in accordance to the DERC Supply Code 2017.

(d) Regulation 42 (Recovery of dues) of DERC Supply Code, 2017 provides right to Respondent to recover the arrears. Also, Regulation 52(3) of DERC Supply Code, 2017 provides that the pending dues of disconnected connection shall be transferred to the account of consumer allowing such connection.

(e) It is further observed that the Respondent's behavior was lethargic in recovery of dues, resulting in accumulation of such heavy dues before removal of meter, in question, of Ms Pushpa Devi.

11. In the light of the above, this court directs as under:

(a) Respondent is directed to revise the bill of CA No.101266629 in the name of Smt. Pushpa Devi on the due amount of Rs.3,14,165.79 on 11.3.2014 with 100% LPSC waiver and fixed charges are recoverable from 11.03.2018 (the date of disconnection) to 10.09.2018 (the date of completion of six months). Revised bill amount be equally served to all the seven connections bearing CA Nos. 153410349, 152866169, 152866170, 154127161, 152866171, 154117513, 154520626, which were energized after 11.3.2018 in part of same property, within seven days of this order, with 15 days notice period (due date).

AW

(b) All the seven connection holders, as stated above point (a) are directed to make the payment of their revised bills within mentioned due date on bills.

(c), The CEO is directed to conduct a vigilance enquiry into the inordinate delay on efforts not taken for recovery of dues which were continuously reflected in the subject connection CA No.xxxx6629 from 2014 to 2018, while the last payment of Rs.97,770/- was made on 31.03.2014.

(d) The compliance report be shared to this office within four weeks.

12. 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 Zamin)
Electricity Ombudsman
17.09.2026