



OFFICE OF THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act, 2003)

B - 53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi - 110057

Phone: 011 - 26144979, email: elect_ombudsman@yahoo.com

Website: <https://electricityombudsmandelhi.co.in>



Appeal No. 31/2026

(Against the CGRF-BYPL's order dated 10.06.2026 passed in Complaint No.42/2026)

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Surjeet Singh

Vs.

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

Present:

Appellant: Shri Surjeet Singh along with his sister, Ms. Nisha Chaudhary

Respondent No.1: Shri Ravinder Singh Bisht, DGM (Legal), Shri Gaurav Agarwal, Sr. Manager, and Shri Ashok Kumar, Advocate, on behalf of BYPL.

Respondent No.2: Shri Ajay Singh along with Advocate, Shri Pankaj Chauhan.

Date of Hearing: 05.10.2026

Date of Order: 08.10.2026

Order

1. Appeal No.31/2026 dated 16.07.2026 has been filed by Shri Surjeet Singh, S/o Late Jai Raj Singh, R/o 32-D, Village Patparganj, Mayur Vihar Phase - 1, Delhi - 110091, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Yamua Power Limited (CGRF-BYPL)'s order dated 10.06.2026 passed in complaint No.42/2026.

2. The background of the case before the Forum was that the Appellant approached the CGRF seeking a directive to the Respondent for the restoration of the electricity supply, vide CA No.154318367, registered in the name of his brother, Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2 before this office), installed at the premises bearing No. 32-D, Patparganj Gaon, Delhi - 110091.



The Appellant contended that the connection was originally installed in the name of their father, late Jai Raj Singh, vide CA No. 101070788. However, after demise of their father on 06.05.2023, Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No. 2) allegedly managed to transfer the connection into his own name under CA No. 154318367 fraudulently and deliberately in collusion with the Respondent. However, his brother intentionally did not pay the electricity bills related to aforesaid CA No.xxxx8367. Thus, the said connection was disconnected in January 2026, and the meter was subsequently removed due to the accumulation of unpaid bills. The Appellant further contended that their sister, Smt. Nisha Chaudhary, is residing on the first floor of the subject premises with her two minor children, as their late father had personally permitted her to live there due to an ongoing matrimonial dispute. He argued that since his sister is in actual physical possession and occupancy of the property, she is legally entitled to an electricity connection at her portion (first floor).

Furthermore, the Appellant pointed out that a number of electricity connections installed at the subject premises in the name of other individuals, including Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No. 2), were not disconnected despite outstanding issues. The Appellant asserted that he filed the complaint on behalf of his sister to support her, and submitted that she was ready to clear the outstanding dues of Rs.10,284/- as per the bill dated 23.02.2026.

3. The Respondent, in its written submission, has strongly contested the maintainability and merits of the complaint, praying for its outright dismissal. The Respondent has raised a preliminary objection regarding the *locus standi* of the Complainant, asserting that Shri Surjeet Singh is neither the registered consumer nor an authorized representative on record. It was contended that the Complainant does not fall within the definition of a "consumer" or an eligible "complainant" under Regulations 2 (d) of the DERC (Guidelines for establishment of Forum and Ombudsman for Redressal of Grievances of Electricity Consumers) Regulations, 2024. Therefore, he is not entitled to invoke the jurisdiction of the Forum.'

Regarding the allegation that the electricity connection of CA No. 101070788 was illegally transferred from the name of the late Jai Raj Singh, the Respondent submitted that the name of change to his son, Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No. 2), was lawfully executed under the "blood relation transfer" category. The Respondent contended that a perusal of the respective K. No. file records reveals that the transfer was validly executed on the basis of a registered General Power of Attorney (GPA) dated 08.03.2021 executed by the original consumer (Shri Jai Raj Singh) and after due verification by the Respondent, which resulted in the issuance of the new connection CA No. 154318367 in the name of Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2).



Regarding the removal of the meter, the Respondent clarified that the connection was disconnected due to the accumulation of outstanding dues amounting to Rs.10,284/-, in accordance with Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003. In support of its contention that the supply should not be restored, the Respondent placed reliance on a written communication dated 14.01.2026 received from the registered consumer, Shri Ajay Singh. In the said letter, Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2) confirmed that while his sister resides at the premises, and uses the electricity supply, the connection belongs exclusively to him and explicitly objected to its restoration without his prior consent.

4. The Forum, in its order dated 10.06.2026, observed that the electricity connection under CA No. 154318367 stands lawfully registered in the name of Sh. Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2). The transfer was validly executed based on a registered General Power of Attorney executed by the original consumer, Late Jai Raj Singh. The Appellant has neither challenged the validity of this transfer before any competent court of law nor produced any documentary evidence to establish that the change of name was fraudulent or illegal. Admittedly, the connection was disconnected due to non-payment of dues of Rs.10,284/-. Since the exclusive contractual relationship exists solely between the Respondent and the registered consumer, Sh. Ajay Singh, the Appellant does not fall within the category of a consumer in respect of the subject connection and possesses no enforceable legal right to seek the restoration of the service.

Regarding the contention that Smt. Nisha Chaudhary is residing in the premises, Forum observed that mere occupancy or possession of a premises does not confer a legal right upon an occupant/third party to seek restoration of an electricity connection standing in the name of another person, particularly when the registered consumer explicitly objects to such restoration.

In the light of the above, the Forum found no merit in the complaint. The Respondent cannot be directed to restore the electricity supply of CA No.154318367 at the instance of the Complainant who is neither the registered consumer nor an authorized representative of the registered consumer. However, it is clarified that if Smt. Nisha Chaudhary is in lawful occupation of any portion of the premises, she shall be at liberty to apply for a fresh electricity connection in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Electricity Act, 2003, DERC Regulations, and the Supply Code, subject to the fulfillment of the requisite formalities.

5. Aggrieved by the CGRF-BYPL order dated 10.06.2026, the Appellant has preferred the present appeal. The primary contention of the Appellant was that the Forum failed to appreciate the factual submissions made in his replication. He submitted that, being a layman, he filed the initial complaint in his own name



instead of filing it in the name of his sister, Smt. Nisha Chaudhary, who is the actual user and occupant of the premises (first floor). The Appellant further submitted that to seek restoration of electricity supply, disconnect on 14.01.2026, his sister was willing to deposit the outstanding bill amount of Rs. 10,284/-, which was deliberately withheld by the Registered Consumer, Shri Ajay Singh (who has been impleaded as Respondent No.2 by this office) to cause her undue harassment. The Appellant argued that the occupant's family (Ms. Nisha Chaudhary) faced severe difficulties during the summer season due to the lack of electricity, forcing them to temporarily obtain supply from another brother's connection. He further argued that since the right to electricity is a fundamental part of the Right to Life, the impugned order dated 10.06.2026 of CGRF-BYPL is liable to be set aside in view of the above-narrated facts.

The Appellant has prayed the following:

- (a) To restore/re-install the electricity meter vide CA No.154318367 in the name of Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2), in the interest of justice.
- (b) To pass any other or further relief which this Authority may deems fit and proper in favour of the Appellant and against the Respondent No.2.

6. The appeal was admitted on 23.07.2026.

7. The Respondent No.1/BYPL, in its written submission, reiterated the preliminary objections previously presented before the CGRF-BYPL. Regarding the allegations of intentional non-payment by the Registered Consumer, Shri Ajay Singh (Respondent No.2) and the presence of multiple connections at the premises No. 32-D, the Respondent No.1 submitted that the disconnection of CA No. 154318367 was executed strictly under Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003, due to an undisputed outstanding bill of Rs.10,284/- dated 23.02.2026. The Respondent No.1 further argued that the existence of other connections within the premises has no relevance to the Appellant's *locus standi* regarding the meter, in question, nor does it establish any malafide on the part of the Discom or the Registered Consumer.

The Respondent No.1 further contended that the Appellant's status as a layman cannot cure the fundamental jurisdictional defect of a lack of *locus standi*. It was submitted that while sister of the Appellant or Shri Ajay Singh may approach the Forum or the Discom in accordance with the law, the Appellant cannot bypass legal requirements by continuing to litigate in his own name at the appellate stage. Furthermore, the Appellant's offer to clear the outstanding dues does not automatically grant him rights over a connection registered in another person's name (Shri Ajay Singh), especially since the Registered Consumer has explicitly



objected to the restoration of the supply without his consent. The Respondent No.1 concluded that while electricity is a valuable facility, its restoration is strictly subject to compliance with the statutory framework and the contractual relationship between the licensee and its registered consumer, meaning that domestic hardship cannot be used as a ground to compel the Discom to ignore these rules.

8. The appeal was fixed for hearing on 05.10.2026. During the hearing, all the parties were present. An opportunity was given to all the parties to plead their respective cases at length and relevant questions were asked by the Ombudsman, Secretary and Advisor (Engineering), to elicit more information on the issue.

9. During the hearing, the Appellant reiterated the detailed arguments, claims, and prayer made in the appeal. The Ombudsman emphasized that the Appellant lacks *locus standi* in this matter to seek the restoration of the disconnected electricity supply. The Advisor (Engineering) highlighted that the disconnection was executed in accordance with Regulation 50 (Ground for Disconnection) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017. Regarding the occupancy claim made by the Appellant's sister, Ms. Nisha Chaudhary, she may apply for a fresh connection by submitting the proof of identity and occupancy in compliance with the applicable regulations.

10. During the hearing, the Advocate appearing for Respondent No. 2 argued that the subject connection was legally transferred to the name of Shri Ajay Singh and was subsequently disconnected due to the non-payment of outstanding dues. He contended that the Appellant's younger sister is forcefully and illegally occupying Shri Ajay Singh's portion of the premises. He further raised arguments regarding a family dispute, which fall beyond the jurisdiction of this office.

11. Further, the Advocate representing the Respondent No.1/BYPL reiterated the arguments, claims, and prayer made in the written submission to this office as well as before the CGRF.

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

- a) In the instant case, the Appellant has prayed for the restoration of the disconnected electricity supply. However, Respondent No. 2 (Shri Ajay Singh, the registered consumer of the connection in question), who alone is entitled to apply for the restoration of the disconnected supply upon payment of outstanding dues, has explicitly objected to its restoration without his prior consent.



b) A perusal of available records reveals that the meter was removed on 14.01.2026 and the six-month period has been elapsed on 13.07.2026. Thus, in accordance with the Regulation 19 'Termination of Agreement' of DERC (Supply Code and Performance Standards) Regulations, 2017, the connection, in question, has become dormant upon remaining disconnected for a continuous period of more than six months for non-payment of dues. Thus, restoration of electricity supply cannot be done at this stage.

c) The sister of the Appellant, Ms. Nisha Chaudhary, claiming to be an occupant of the premises, may apply afresh for a new electricity connection by submitting the relevant documents under Regulation 10(2) & (3) of the DERC Supply Code, 2017.

13. In the light of the above, this court upholds the order dated 10.06.2026 of CGRF-BYPL.

14. 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.



Electricity Ombudsman
08.10.2026