

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: 011-26144979 E.Mail: elect_ombudsman@yahoo.com)

Appeal No.29/2025

(Against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 08.05.2025 in C.G. No. 22/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Sachin Kumar

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited

Present:

Appellant: Shri Sachin Kumar, in person.

Respondent No: Shri S.S.Meena, Addl. General Manager, Shri Ajay Joshi, AGM (Legal), Shri Santosh Mishra, Z.M. and Shri Devender Dogra, Manager, on behalf of TPDDL

Date of Hearing: 30.07.2025

Date of Order: 31.07.2025

ORDER

1. Appeal No. 29/2025 dated 29.05.2025 has been filed by Shri Sachin Kumar, R/o 2188/2A, Village Shadi Khampur, Main Patel Road, Delhi - 110008, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (CGRF-TPDDL)'s order dated 08.05.2025 in C.G. No. 22/2025.

2. The background of the case is that the residents of Street No. 2187 and 2188, Main Patel Road, Village Shadi Kampur, Delhi – 110008, requested the District Manager's Office of the Respondent (Discom) on 23.07.2024, for a resolution to the massive clutter of electricity cables/wires, which might lead to fire incidents, on urgent basis. Consequently, the Discom installed two electricity poles to support loose and hanging electricity cables/wires to resolve the problem.

3. However, the Appellant, Shri Sachin Kumar, who is resident of House No. 2188/2A, Second Floor approached the Discom on 10.02.2025, with a concern that an unauthorized electric pole was installed in front of his property which posed an obstruction to the entrance of his property and is also a serious safety risks. He requested for its removal. Though, he was assured by the Discom's officials that within three days the pole would be removed but no action was taken by them. It was alleged by the Appellant that a gratification of Rs.2,500/- was demanded by one of their senior

officer, which shows unethical conduct and harassment caused to him. After various e-mails, written reminders and with the intervention of the police, the pole was removed on 04.03.2025.

4. Subsequently, Appellant filed a complaint with Internal Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – TPDDL (ICGRF-TPDDL), stating (i) after vigorous persuasion, the Discom took 25 days to remove the pole as requested by him, (ii) while removing the pole, the old connection box feeding five connections was broken by the staff of the Discom, connections were provided directly with a line with tapping instead of bus-bar, (iii) strict action against the officials who misbehaved with him, (iv) a request to immediately install bus-bar for 4-5 connections and (v) a compensation of Rs. 5 lakh. The Discom, in its reply, informed the Appellant that there is no such unsafe installation found at the site and the damaged bus-bar and iron pole have already been removed, and no further action is pending at their end.

5. Against this, the Appellant approached the CGRF-TPDDL on 18.03.2025, reiterating his complaint as submitted to the ICGRF-TPDDL, contending that the Discom installed the electric pole in front of his property without his consent and knowledge and requested for the following:

- a) Strict action against Shri Mishra and Shri Sugreev for harassment, negligence and threats. .
- b) Immediate correction of the unsafe installation at TDPPDL's expenses.
- c) Written clarification as to why his complaints were ignored and why Discom's officials resorted to threats.

The Appellant again submitted a complaint to the Forum on 05.04.2025, reiterating his contention and request for the following:

- i) Direct the Discom to install the original bus-bar (4-5 connections) at his premises without any additional cost.
- ii) Initiate an internal enquiry against the officials, including Shri Sugreev and Shri Mishra.
- iii) Direct the Discom to provide a written apology with a commitment to transparency in communication with consumers.
- iv) To ensure any future modification and installation around his property, be done only with his prior written approval/proper consultation.
- v) A suitable compensation for mental harassment and inconvenience caused to him.



In support of his claims, all the relevant documents were produced before the Forum by him, which were taken on record.

6. The Discom, in its reply to the Forum, asserted that the pole in question was installed at the request of the residents of Street No. 2187 & 2188 of the same area vide their written request dated 23.07.2024, regarding massive clutter of electric cables/wire, and submitted photographs of the chaotic condition of cables/wires due to narrow streets and long service cables. The Discom further submitted that earlier these were placed on angles to maintain safe height, but, due to breaking of one angle, cables/wires was hanging down. To resolve this issue permanently, two poles installed but later the pole erected in front of the Appellant's house was removed on his complaint and was replaced by an angle. The second pole remained at the end of the street.

Regarding the installation of a bus-bar exclusively for 4-5 connections catering to the electric supply to the Appellant's property, the Discom submitted that the earlier bus-bar, which was feeding 10-12 service connections, was damaged and hence removed. As the complainant insisted that he would not allow the electric connections to other consumers through this bus-bar, except for his 3-4 connections, the connections feeding electric supply to his premises were taped safely and securely. There are no loose wires. The remaining connections were installed on the next pole in the line. In case, the complainant allows the installation of a new bus-bar on his property's wall, which was existing earlier also, the Discom would replace it and route the cables of all other connections through it to restore the previous position. The other allegations, viz; unethical behaviour, demand for gratification, delay in the removal of pole and undue harassment, all are without any substance and purely an afterthought.

7. The CGRF-TPDDL, in its order dated 08.05.2025, opined that on request of the residents of Street No. 2187 & 2188, the Respondent had installed two electric poles to resolve the issue of hanging wires. However, no consent from the complainant was taken either by the other residents or by the Respondent before installing the pole near his residence's entrance. This pole was later removed after receiving the complaint from the complainant. The Forum further observed that the process for the removal of the said pole took some time, since necessary approval, etc. also had to be taken, which may have resulted in delay. Therefore, the delay in the removal of said pole by the Respondent was not beyond reasonable time and was not intentional either.

Regarding the condition of bus-bar and the number of connections going through it before the said pole shifted, remains inconclusive, as neither party could conclusively establish the number of existing connections. However, presently 4-5 cables of the complainant's connections are taped by the Respondent, and bus-bar is not used by the Respondent. The complainant has raised concerns about the safety conditions of the taped cables/wires. The Forum opined that maintaining safety standards is the utmost responsibility of the service provider, and they have undertaken that the maintenance of



the network and cable etc. is their duty and that they will ensure a safe condition is maintained.

With regard to installation of dedicated bus-bar for the complainant's property, there is no such provision in the DERC's regulations. However, onus is upon the Respondent under the regulations to use bus-bar and in certain conditions, and disallowed the request of the complainant.

In view of the above, the Forum directed the Respondent to conduct periodic safety checks on the taped cables and the network to ensure safe condition of electric supply, and to conduct an Internal Inquiry on the basis of contentions made by the complainant against the two officers.

8. Not satisfied by the CGRF-TPDDL's above cited order, the Appellant has filed an appeal on 29.05.2025, reiterating the submission as placed before the Forum. In addition, the Appellant asserted that the Forum rejected his complaint without providing appropriate relief or compensation, and failed to address the discriminatory treatment and misconduct by the Respondent's officials. The Appellant requested consideration of his appeal to set-aside the CGRF-BYPL's order dated 08.05.2025, direct reinstatement of the bus-bar, award a compensation and an independent investigation into the issues raised in the appeal.

9. The Discom, in its written submission vide letter dated 01.07.2025 to this office reiterated its submission as before the Forum. In addition, the Discom asserted that there was no claim with regard to compensation in the original complaint dated 18.03.2025 before the Forum. With the progression of the proceedings of the Forum, the Appellant started raising several other issues including compensation. Rather he had withdrawn his claim for compensation during the hearing before the Forum. Further, the Respondent has carried out activities, such as, installation of pole and service lines realignment for network improvement and safety concerns of residents. Even, the pole installed near to his premises was also removed. Therefore, there is no delay or deficiency in any service on the part of the Discom, in accordance with DERC's Supply Code, 2017. All allegations with respect of harassment, intimidation and illegal gratification are wrong and without substance. Regarding restoration a safe and dedicated bus-bar to the Appellant, the Discom is always ready to restore the previous position provided that connections to other consumers through the same bus-bar would also be provided.

10. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 30.07.2025. During the hearing, the Appellant was present, in person, and the Respondent was represented by its authorized representatives/advocate. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases before the Ombudsman at length and relevant questions were asked by the Ombudsman, Advisor and Secretary, to elicit more information on the issue.



11. During the hearing, the Appellant reiterated his contentions, allegations against the officials of TPDDL, in detail, and prayer in the appeal. In support, a photograph of iron-pole, in question, was presented before the Ombudsman by the Appellant for showing its unsafe/hazardous/wrong position before removal. This caused undue harassment to him. Presently, he resides in his another premises and this property, having non-domestic (NX) connection, is his second property which was being used for commercial purposes. However, presently the commercial activity is not carried out and was stopped since Covid-19 pandemic. Moreover, his application dated 03.07.2025 for change in category of NX connection from non-domestic to domestic was not allowed owing to pendency claim by the Respondent in instant appeal before this office, however, he could not show/produce any request number.

12. In rebuttal, Respondent reiterated its written submission and refuted all the allegations levelled by the Appellant. In response to a query by the Ombudsman on the untoward/unsafe tilted installation of iron-pole at the entrance corner of the building gate as was appeared in the photograph, Officer present asserted that the straightening of pole, muffing, earthing and sagging wires could not be completed as stopped in the midst with installation of only iron-pole (without any wire set-up) by the Appellant. The tilt-position of pole's straightening, earthing and pole muffing was to be carried out. Moreover, the pole could not be removed within settled time because the work of fitting second pole was in progress which could not be obstructed in view of safety parameters. The photograph of second pole was shown to the Ombudsman to substantiate their assertion. As far as fixation of immediate bus-bar after removal of iron-pole instead to route the connections directly by taping it in an unsafe manner was concerned, Respondent repeated its assertions as narrated in the written submission.

13. Further, in response to a query by the Advisor (Engineering) regarding whether any permission was obtained from the MCD before installation of the pole, in question, Respondent could not present convincing response despite submitting that the residents of the area through its Councillor had requested to carry out the work, but the requisite permissions from the MCD and the Appellant's consent were not taken. However, it was explained that had the necessary permission taken from the MCD before installation of alleged pole, the matter would not have lingered on unnecessarily. The Officer present could not further answer adequately in response to a query by the Secretary as to whether any site visit was carried out of the premises to know the existence of front gate or rear gate, width of the street etc. before installation of unnumbered iron-pole.

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

- a) The issue of pole has already been resolved.
- b) It is a fact that a previous bus-bar existed on the wall of the complainant, from where 10-12 connections were being supplied electricity. When the Discom tried to reinstall the new bus-bar at the same place, the Appellant resisted,



insisting that only his 3-4 connections be allowed, and that no other connections could be allowed from this bus-bar. Consequently, the impasse of bus-bar remained unsolved, and 3-4 connections were directly installed from the network with proper tapping and ensuring safety.


- c) A picture of the subject property is showing that the lane is very narrow and the pole is not there.
- d) Compensation is not justified as DB/bus-bar installation is pending due to the Appellant's reluctance. Yet, it is clear that there was a delay in removing the pole from front of the Appellant's residence.

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

- i) The Discom to install Distribution Box(DB)/Bus-Bar(BB), as previous arrangement for 10-12 connections within a three (3) days on receipt of this order.
- ii) Initiate a vigilance enquiry against erring officials for their misbehaviour, misconduct and threat etc., as claimed by the Appellant and share with this office within three weeks' time.
- iii) CEO may also have a look into the circumstances of the present complaint/appeal. There is a certain apathy and callousness of the officers dealing with the complaint/complainant which requires to be addressed through sensitization and training.

16. 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
31.07.2025