

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. 49/2025

(Against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 28.10.2025 in CG. No.107/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

Smt. Jyoti Rani

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)

Present:

Appellant: Shri Rohit Chauhan, spouse of the Appellant.

Respondent: Shri Jamal Nasir, Sr. Manager & Shri Anil Kumar, Executive
on behalf of the TPDDL

Date of Hearing: 28.01.2026

Date of Order: 29.01.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.49/2025 has been filed by Smt. Jyoti Rani, W/o Shri Rohit Chauhan, R/o H.No.155 D,Dhaka Village, Kingsway Camp, Delhi - 110009, through her spouse/authorized representative, Shri Rohit Chauhan, against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 28.10.2025 passed in CG No.107/2025.

2. The background of the case, as per Appellant's complaint dated 02.09.2025, presented before the Forum indicates that she purchased the premises bearing H. No.820, Garhi Bakhtawar Pur, Delhi - 110036, from Smt. Mayawati (now deceased), wife of late Shri Jagmal, on 30.10.2013, where an electricity connection (energized on 17.06.1991) already existed in the name of Smt. Mayawati. Since then she has been in possession of the aforementioned premises. Relevant documents viz. copies of General Power of Attorney, Agreement to Sell & Purchase, Affidavit,



Receipt, Possession Letter, Deed of Will, all dated 30.10.2023 were submitted before the CGRF by the Appellant. However, she got transferred the name of connection to her name, vide CA No.60030915973 in 2023, her mobile no.8882332311 and e-mail ID jyotirajput@hotmail.com was also updated in the records accordingly. Despite having all the necessary details with the TPDDL, she did not receive any bill for May-2025. Upon downloading a duplicate bill in July-25, it was revealed that her name as Registered Consumer appeared on the bill, but the mobile and e-mail ID had been replaced with unknown mobile no. and mail ID without any information by the TPDDL to her. During her visit to the office of TPDDL, she discovered that one Shri Rahul Chauhan had submitted a request for a name change of her connection CA No.XXXXX5973 to his name, based on a General Power of Attorney executed by her in his favor on 20.05.2025. Relevant documents were also attached to this name change application. She immediately raised an objection and explained to the officials of TPDDL that a forged and fabricated General Power of Attorney (GPA)/Affidavit had been created by Shri Rahul Chauhan. Moreover, he had also produced a forged and fabricated Will, executed on 20.01.2023, in his favour by Smt. Mayawati. However, the Appellant had never executed any GPA in his favour. This fraudulent act of transferring her connection to his name, based on ill intent or illegal possession of utility services, warrants criminal proceedings against Shri Rahul Chauhan under various sections of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS). In response to this unlawful action, a police complaint has already been lodged by the Appellant to the Alipur Police Station.

She requested, (i) a comprehensive investigation into the documents submitted by Shri Rahul Chauhan to TPDDL, (ii) verification of the authenticity of the alleged GPA and related documents, (iii) reversal of the name transfer, (vi) initiation criminal proceedings against Shri Rahul Chauhan for his fraudulent actions, (v) prevent any further misuse of forged documents in TPDDL's system or any other government or utility authority.

3. The Discom, in its written submission dated 15.09.2025, presented before the Forum that earlier an electricity connection was existed in the name of Mrs. Jyoti Rani under CA No.60030915973 (energized on 17.06.1991) at Village Bakhtawar Pur city, Delhi - 110036, for domestic use with a sanctioned load of 1 KW. However, in May 2025, Shri Rahul Chauhan applied for a name change and submitted necessary documents such as a copy of Aadhar and a General Power of Attorney along with the Attribute Change Form. Consequently, the connection was transferred on 28.05.2025 to the name of Shri Rahul Chauhan under new CA No.60034783369.



Following this, the Appellant visited the office of the Respondent on 25.07.2025. She informed that she remains the owner of the premises as she had not sold the premises to anyone and that the documents submitted by Shri Rahul Chauhan are forged and fabricated. Subsequently, the Respondent issued a show-cause notice dated 04.08.2025 to him, requesting the submission of correct documents with a complete back chain within 15 days; failure to do so would result in the initiation of the process to revert the name change to Smt. Jyoti Rani. Upon his failure to appear, the connection name was once again transferred to her name, along with the restoration of her mobile number and e-mail ID in the electricity bill. Therefore, the Respondent has taken timely corrective action and has already addressed her grievance. Furthermore, it is on record that Shri Rahul Chauhan has committed forgery, and a complaint has already been filed against him at the Alipur Police Station by the Appellant, which will be resolved by the competent court or authority.

4. The Appellant submitted a rejoinder on 06.10.2025, challenging the preliminary objections and asserting that due to Shri Rahul Chauhan's failure to provide authentic documents, the connection was reinstated in her name. However, TPDDL, in its written submission, has inaccurately and misleadingly asserted that no negligence or collusion occurred. As a public utility company, TPDDL has a legal obligation to safeguard consumers against fraud. The significant negligence and careless behavior of its officials enabled this fraudulent activity, constituting a serious breach of duty and punishable collusion. The Appellant also referenced various judgments from the CGRF, the Ombudsman, and the Delhi High Court to support her argument. Furthermore, the Appellant requested, (i) punitive action against the negligent officials of TPDDL, (ii) suitable compensation for the undue harassment caused to her, and (iii) imposition of exemplary costs or damages on TPDDL.

5. The Forum, in its order dated 28.10.2025, noted that certain reliefs and grievances presented by the Complainant are misplaced, as the forum lacks jurisdiction over criminal procedures or investigations. The forum is governed by the existing DERC Supply Code, 2017. Additionally, the Respondent does not possess a mechanism to verify the authenticity of the documents. Nevertheless, upon receiving any objections, they are obligated to reassess the documents by issuing a show-cause notice to the individual who submitted them. Consequently, in this instant matter, the Respondent acted in accordance with the regulations by restoring the power connection in the name of the original RC (Complainant) within a reasonable timeframe. Furthermore, it is a settled law that having electricity does not create or take away any legal right on the property. Therefore, the assertion of the

du.

Complainant is not correct that there could be any misuse of service or illegal possession of utility.

Forum concluded that the Respondent took timely corrective action. Moreover, they found no grounds to award any compensation to the Complainant, as outlined above. However, she is at liberty to approach the appropriate criminal or civil court regarding the forged GPA/documents submitted by Shri Rahul Chauhan.

6. The Appellant, not satisfied by the order dated 28.10.2025, passed by the CGRF-TPDDL, has filed this appeal, reiterating her stand as before the CGRF.

She contended that the following grounds were not considered by the Forum:

- (i) CGRF's disregard of evidence which demonstrates the gross and deliberate negligence,
- (ii) Erroneous findings on due diligence for the protection of consumer interests,
- (iii) Ignorance of binding precedents which establish that the wrongful/fraudulent change of name without verification constitutes a clear deficiency in service.
- (iv) Inaction on statutory violations by TPDDL under the Electricity Act, 2003, specifically Section 43 (Duty to Supply), Section 57 (Standards of Performance) and Section 142 (Penalty for non-compliance of Commission's directions).
- (v) Failure of Internal Protocol by officials of TPDDL which proves their collusion or gross negligence.
- (vi) Rejection of compensation and penalty even after acknowledging the wrongful transfer and undue harassment caused to the Appellant.
- (vii) Harassment through multi-litigation as TPDDL's error in accepting the forged document has allowed Shri Rahul Chauhan to misuse it to perpetuate harassment by initiating/continuing multiple litigations against the Appellant



- (viii) Impugned CGRF's order is contrary to the principles of natural justice, equity and fairness and requires to be set-aside.

The Appellant has requested for the following relief:

- i) To set-aside/modify the impugned order dated 28.10.2025 of CGRF-TPDDL.
- ii) To issue appropriate direction/order to the TPDDL, its authorized agents servants and employees to immediately restore/continue the permanent electricity connection at the premises of the Appellant.
- iii) To issue a specific direction against the Respondent – Mr Rahul Chauhan, restraining him from misusing the fraudulent transfer document and taking advantage of the same to initiate or defend multiple litigations concerning the property where the electricity connection was installed, thereby harassing the Appellant.
- iv) To impose a penalty on the Respondent Company for its non-compliance with the duty of care and for facilitating the fraudulent act.
- v) To award compensation on account of undue harassment and Respondent's negligence and deficiency in service, as per DERC Supply Code, 2017.
- vi) To pass a direction for the registration of an FIR against Mr. Rahul Chauhan.
- vii) To award the cost of the litigation expenses in favour of the Appellant & against the Respondent.
- viii) To pass any other relief/order/direction in her favour as this Forum may deem fit and proper.

7. The Discom, in its written appeal submission dated 06.01.2026, reiterated the facts previously presented to the CGRF-TPDDL. The Discom refuted all allegations made by the Appellant. Furthermore, the Discom asserted that the cited judgments are not relevant to the current case. Additionally, there has been no statutory breach by the officials of the TPDDL, nor any negligence in processing the documents



submitted by Shri Rahul Chauhan. The Respondent has acted in accordance with DERC's guidelines. It is important to note that there exists a family dispute involving the Appellant, which should be addressed in civil or criminal courts. Moreover, the Appellant's connection remains active with CA No.60034783369 (which was changed from CA No.60030915973 in May 2025), thus, there is no basis for restoring this connection. The Respondent contended that the Appellant is not entitled to the relief sought.

8. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 28.01.2026. During the hearing, the Appellant was represented by her spouse Shri Rohit Chauhan and the Respondent was represented by its authorized representatives. An opportunity was given to both the parties to plead their respective cases at length. Relevant questions were also asked by the Ombudsman as well as the Advisor, Secretary to elicit more information on the issue.

9. During the hearing, the spouse representing the Appellant reiterated the claim of malafide intent by Shri Rahul Chauhan, which has led to undue harassment to the Appellant, along with the grounds and requests outlined in the appeal. He asserted that the late Smt. Mayawati, his maternal grandmother, executed a Will and General Power of Attorney in favour of the Appellant, Smt. Jyoti Rani, on the basis of transaction of amount in favour of Smt. Mayawati. The property has already been transferred in the name of the Appellant based on these documents. Apart from that, she is not currently residing at the property but she is still lawful owner and in possession of the premises. Nonetheless, Shri Rahul Chauhan, his cousin, has trespassed onto the property several times, prompting her to file complaints with the police station. Regarding the strict penal action or FIR against Shri Rahul Chauhan, the Ombudsman highlighted that the Appellant may opt to lodge a complaint against him under Section 156 (3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita. The AR submitted that a complaint has already been filed in this regard and the matter is sub-judice.

10. In response, the officer representing the Respondent reiterated the arguments presented in the written submission. However, the Respondent failed to provide a satisfactory answer to the specific queries raised by the Advisor (Engineering), namely, (i) whether the Appellant was notified about the name change process via her mobile number or e-mail ID, and (ii) whether the documents pertaining to the back chain were verified during the name change process, given that the name change had already been executed in 2023 by Smt. Jyoti Rani. The signature of Smt. Jyoti Rani could have been verified prior to the name change. Furthermore, the



Respondent reiterated the settled law that having electricity does not create or take away any legal right on the property and the present matter is related to property dispute amongst the family.

11. During the hearing, the Ombudsman highlighted that prior to the transfer of the name of the connection, the Appellant could have been notified through her e-mail address, mobile number, or a letter with confirmed delivery. Without the Appellant's knowledge or consent, her mobile number and e-mail address were replaced with that of one Shri Rahul Chauhan. The principle of due diligence should have been adhered to by the Respondent at an early stage to prevent the undue harassment experienced by the Appellant.

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

- (a) Ms. Jyoti Rani has emphasized that her name in the electricity connection was changed in 2023 from deceased Mayawati to Ms Jyoti Rani by the Respondent only after submitting all relevant documents. She contended that she is lawful registered consumer of the connection which was wrongfully and fraudulently transferred without her consent or knowledge, which proves collusion or negligence or both by the TPDDL. She sought various reliefs including restoration of her original connection in her name and to direct the Respondent to pay adequate compensation to the Appellant for mental agony and deficiency of services as per Supply Code, 2017.
- (b) To know more, the documents/files of name change were sought from the Respondent and were received. On close scrutiny, it is found that in the month of March-2023, her name change case was processed. All documents signed by Ms Jyoti Rani are in Hindi. Appellant has provided her Mobile No. & mail, which is shown in her bill. Thus, it creates suspicion that why Respondent company did not try to reach her through these mode, which is nowhere on record.
- (c) Firstly, Respondent changed mobile no. and mail ID of Ms Jyoti Rani, owing to which she could not get alert and subsequently Respondent sent a Notice through post for name change. It seems that officials of TPDDL and Shri Rahul Chauhan colluded as alleged by the Appellant.




- (d) Ms. Jyoti Rani's name was changed in May 2023 (about two years ago) and all files are available in digital form. For processing the request for name change, the Respondent was required to do due diligence.
- (e) Appellant had prayed multiple reliefs in her appeal. Out of those, only one relief is fit for consideration i.e. compensation for causing mental agony and harassment to her. However, her name has already been restored against her permanent connection

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

- (i) An enquiry be conducted to ascertain the circumstances under which the name was changed without undertaking due diligence. On the base of enquiry, needful protocol be developed so that this kind of harassment is not caused in future.
- (ii) As the Complainant/Appellant has suffered mental agony and harassment, the Respondent is required to compensate Rs.10,000/- in the interest of natural justice and fair play.
- (iii) Action Taken Report (ATR) be shared within the office in next 30 days.

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.


(P.K. Bhardwaj)
Electricity Ombudsman
29.01.2026