

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. 50/2025
(Against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 14.08.2025 in CG. No.46/2025)

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Amit Sharma

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL)

Present:

Appellant Shri Amit Sharma alongwith Shri Vinod Kumar, advocate.
Respondent No.1: Shri Jamal Nasir & Shri Utkarsh Bindal, Sr. Managers, on behalf of the TPDDL.
Respondent No.2: None was present.
Date of Hearing: 10.02.2026
Date of Order: 11.02.2026

ORDER

1. Appeal No.50/2025 has been filed by Shri Amit Sharma, S/o Late Kishori Lal, R/o 1/34, Ram Bazar, Ram Chowk, Kashmira Gate, Delhi - 110006, through advocate, Shri Vinod Kumar, against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 14.08.2025 passed in CG No.46/2025.
2. The background of the case, as per the Appellant in his complaint dated 15.04.2025, presented before the Forum stated that he is the owner of a piece of land, measuring 11 Biswas (550 Sq. Yards) out of Khasra No.1/23/1, Plot No.1030, Block-D, Gali No.10, Budh Bazar Road, Nathupura Village, Burari, Delhi - 110084. This property was acquired by his father, Shri Kishori Lal, from Shri Nathu Ram, son of Shri Ramji Lal, on 19.04.1983 through a registered Sale Deed. Subsequently, his father



applied for the mutation of the plot in the revenue records, and Khasra/Khatoni documents dated 25.01.1984 and 06.10.2003 respectively which were issued by the Illaqa Patwari in his name accordingly. Furthermore, following the mutation, his father constructed a boundary wall and built a room at the rear of the plot, where a hand pump was also installed. Additionally, an electricity connection (CA No.60017107875) was activated on 24.08.2013 with a sanctioned load of 1 KW under the domestic category. Throughout his lifetime, his father did not execute any sale deed/documents to any party. Since its acquisition, the property has belonged to his father and his family members, including his wife, Smt. Bharpai Devi, and two sons, Shri Anand Sharma and Shri Amit Sharma (the Complainant), who are in physical possession and occupation of the property. Following the death of his father on 05.01.1987, and subsequently his mother and elder brother, he, as the legal heir, is the sole owner of the aforementioned plot.

The Appellant asserted that a judgment dated 19.10.1994 was also passed in his favor concerning the title and possession of the aforementioned plot, as per civil suit no.401/1991, filed by him and his brother against Shri Satish Kumar Thussu (a land grabber) for a permanent injunction. Additionally, an FIR was registered against Shri Parshuram at the Police Station, Swaroop Nagar. He (Parshuram) was also attempting to obtain an electricity connection based on a forged and fabricated mutation application of 2018. In response, an appeal was filed by him before the Additional District Magistrate, and the Hon'ble Court granted a status quo on the said property through an order dated 24.03.2021. Moreover, a civil suit was filed against Parshuram and others. However, the Civil Judge at Rohini Court granted a restraining order against Shri Parshuram and others via an order dated 05.03.2021. Despite letter dated 07.04.2021 and an e-mail dated 09.04.2021 sent to the Respondent, informing about court orders to maintain status quo at the said property and request to stop installation of new electricity connection, they proceeded to install the electricity connection CA No.60029207747 in the name of Smt. Kailaso Devi, wife of Shri Parshuram, unlawfully and illegally on 17.03.2022, in violation of DERC Rules and Regulations. Furthermore, his email dated 11.08.2024 did not receive a satisfactory response.

The Appellant has requested that the Respondent be instructed to remove the aforementioned electricity connection in the interest of justice.

3. The Discom, in its written submission dated 28.04.2025, presented before the Forum that the Complainant has raised an issue of property dispute with Shri Parshuram, as evidenced by the submissions and documents provided by him. The



Complainant is requesting for removal of the electricity connection installed in the name of Ms. Kailaso, wife of Shri Parshuram. Consequently, she should also be impleaded as a necessary party. Regarding the electricity connection with CA No.60029207747, it was applied for by Ms. Kailaso, wife of Shri Parshuram. However, this connection was energized on 17.03.2022 in the name of Ms. Kailaso at Plot No.1030, Kh. No.1/22, Ground Floor, Block-D, Budh Bazar Road, Street No.6, Village Nathupura, Delhi - 110084, for NDL (Non-Domestic Light) for 1 KW, based on a notarized General Power of Attorney (GPA) for Plot No.1030, which measures 200 square yards out of a total of 400 square yards at Khasra No.1/22, executed by Shri Parshuram, son of Shri Shis Ram, in her favor, along with an Aadhar Card issued in her name, showing the address D-1030, Gali No.10, Nathupura, Budh Bazar, Delhi - 110084. Additionally, a Status Report dated 08.10.2018 was issued by the Tehsildar (Civil Lines) and other documents related to Khasra/Khatauni. Furthermore, by an Order dated 16.08.2019, the concerned Tehsildar, upon the application of Shri Parshuram for mutation, ordered that the subject land/property measuring 400 square yards out of Khasra No.1/22, located in D-Block out of a total area of 4 Bigha 16 Biswa, Nathupura, Delhi, be mutated in the name of the applicant. Therefore, the electricity connection was granted based on the documents and clarifications provided by Ms. Kailaso concerning the applied premises, without any irregularities

Moreover, there are multiple ongoing litigations between the parties before various authorities and courts regarding the property dispute raised by the complainant. In this context, the Forum lacks the jurisdiction to address issues involving property disputes. According to Regulation 10 (1) (vii) of the DERC Supply Code & Performance Standards Regulations, 2017, "The electricity bill shall be only for electricity supply to the premises occupied by the consumer and shall not be treated as having rights or title over the premises."

4. Smt. Kailaso Devi, as Respondent No.2, in her written submission, presented before the Forum refuted all the contents/allegations levelled by the Appellant except pendency of the civil suit filed by the Appellant against her husband. She asserted that her husband, Shri Parshuram, is the owner of Khasra No.1/22, H.No.1030. The plot measuring 400 sq. Yards is in the possession of her husband since long. However, the Complainant claims himself to be the owner of plot measuring approx. 453 Sq. Yards (10 biswas) out of Khasra No.1/23/1 vide Plot No.1030, D-Block, Gali No.10, Main Budh Bazar, Nathupura, Delhi. He has filed numerous false cases against her husband which caused undue harassment. In fact, the demarcation of the plot was carried out on the orders of the SDM and the orders of the SDM were passed in favour of her husband. After following due process, she had got the electricity connection on



the basis of genuine ownership. Even, the complainant has no document to prove his ownership over the plot in which electricity connection has been granted. He has no concern with this land, therefore, the complaint was liable to be dismissed.

5. The Appellant, in his rejoinder dated 29.07.2025, reiterated his stand as in the complaint. In addition, he asserted that the Respondent No.2 and her husband created false and fabricated GPA by changing the Khasra Number of the property as 1/22 instead of actual Khasra No.1/23/1. Moreover, perusal of documents revealed that the stamp paper of GPA was purchased on 05.08.1978 by the Respondent No.2 but prepared the GPA upon the said stamp paper on 15.10.1981 of the aforesaid property and are claiming right over it. Hence, Smt. Kailaso alongwith her husband, Shri Parshuram, had manipulated the Khasra Number and prepared the forged & fabricated title documents in order to get the temporary connection in her name at the aforesaid premises (Kh. No.1/22). Furthermore, the connection is of temporary in nature with approval period of six months only as per DERC Rules and Regulations. However, the same is supplying electricity since 2022, in violation of DERC Supply Code, 2017.

6. The Forum, in its order dated 14.08.2025, observed the assertion presented by TPDDL (Respondent No.1), under which Discom claimed that the connection, in question, was granted on the basis of submission of requisite documents, including a notarized General Power of Attorney (GPA) in the name of Smt. Kailaso, a copy of Khasra/Khatoni, and a status report issued by the Tehsildar (Civil Lines), all related to Plot No.1030, which covered an area of 200 square yards out of a total of 400 square yards at Khasra No.1/22. Smt. Kailaso Devi (RC) was also impleaded as Respondent No.2 before the Forum. She argued that she is the legitimate owner and occupant of the property identified by Khasra No.1/22, and that the connection was installed based on valid documents.

The Forum noted that the Complainant asserted ownership of the property designated as Khasra No.1/23/1, while the electricity connection CA No.60029207747, in question, was installed at Khasra No.1/22 in the name of Smt. Kailaso Devi (Respondent No.2) by the Respondent No.1/(TPDDL). Nevertheless, the Complainant did not provide any evidence to substantiate his claim of ownership over Khasra No.1/22. In fact, his complaint referenced the address as Plot No.1030, Khasra No.1/22, but lacked any supporting documentation. Moreover, there is no provision in the prevailing regulations that would allow for the verification of the authenticity of documents by the Discom. Admittedly, there is dispute between Smt. Kailaso (Respondent No.2) and the Complainant concerning the properties identified as Khasra No.1/23/1 and/or Khasra No.1/22, which falls outside the jurisdiction of the Forum.



Furthermore, the property at Khasra No.1/22 is currently occupied by Smt. Kailaso. Both parties are already engaged in legal proceedings to resolve the title dispute. Consequently, given the facts and circumstances, no order for the removal of the connection could be issued. Additionally, the electricity connection does not take away or create any right, title or interest of property. Hence, the complaint was dismissed accordingly.

7. The Appellant, not satisfied by the order dated 14.08.2025, passed by the CGRF-TPDDL, has filed this appeal, reiterating his stand as before the CGRF.

He submitted the following information:

- (i) That a connection CA No.60017107875 was installed in the name of his late brother, Shri Anand Sharma, which was stolen by the Respondent 2, however, this revealed fact was not considered by the CGRF. Even she (R-2) prepared forged and fabricated title documents in order to get the temporary connection in her name. Respondent violated DER rules and regulations deliberately while granting connection, in question.
- (ii) Shri Parshuram, husband of Smt. Kailaso has taken the possession of Appellant's property illegally against whom he has lodged a FIR to the Police Station, Swaroop Nagar, Delhi. Besides that, a civil suit, filed against land grabbers Shri Parshuram and Ors., was also passed in his favour by Dist. Court (Rohini) vide restraining order dated 05.03.2021.
- (iii) Despite submission of all the documents, CGRF jumped to a conclusion and passed the impugned order which is liable to be set-aside.

The Appellant has requested for the following relief:

- i) To set-aside the impugned order dated 14.08.2025.
- ii) To direct the Respondent No.1/TPDDL to remove the temporary electricity connection of CA No.60029207747 installed at the above said property.
- iii) To award compensation for undue harassment caused to him.
- iv) To pass any other relief in his favour in the interest of justice.



8. The Discom, in its written submission dated 07.01.2026 to the appeal, reiterated the facts that had previously been presented to the CGRF-TPDDL. The Discom denied all allegations made by the Appellant. Additionally, the Discom stated that Smt. Kailaso, wife of Shri Parshuram, applied for a new electricity connection (Long Term Temporary) on 25.02.2022 at Plot No.1030, Khasra No.1/22, Ground Floor. Relevant documents were submitted by her along with the application. Consequently, the site verification was conducted to assess the feasibility of installing the meter, and outstanding dues were also verified. Ultimately, on 08.03.2022, the demand note was issued, which she paid on 11.03.2022. As a result, the meter was installed on 17.03.2022 after adhering to the proper procedures. The Appellant was requested by the CGRF to provide proof of ownership related to Khasra No.1/22, but he did not submit any such documentation. Furthermore, the connection was installed on Khasra No.1/22 rather than 1/23/1.

9. The appeal was admitted and fixed for hearing on 10.02.2026. Smt. Kailaso Devi was also impleaded as a necessary party (Respondent No.2) before this office. Notices dated 28.01.2026 issued to all the concerned parties accordingly. During the hearing, the Appellant was present alongwith advocate, Shri Vinod Kumar. Respondent No.1 (TPDDL) was represented by its authorized representatives. However, none was present on behalf of Respondent No.2 (Smt. Kailaso). 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.

10. During the hearing, the Advocate representing the Appellant reiterated the contentions, arguments, and prayer made in the appeal. In response to a specific query regarding whether Plot No. 1030, Khasra No. 1/23/1 and Plot No. 1030, Khasra No. 1/22 are the same or different, the Appellant asserted that he is the legitimate owner of Plot No. 1030, Khasra No. 1/23/1, as evidenced by the Sale Deed and GPA, and that the actual Khasra No. 1/22 is located very far from his plot. However, the husband of Respondent No. 2 had tampered with the documents by mentioning Khasra No. 1/22 in place of Khasra No.1/23/1 for obtaining electricity connections and encroachment purpose, for which he has filed multiple FIRs/litigations due to his unlawful actions, as detailed in his appeal. In response to an additional query from the Advisor (Engineering) regarding the current status of Appeal No.01/2021 filed before the Deputy Commissioner, Central District, the Appellant stated that the appeal is still pending.



11. In rebuttal, the officer representing the Respondent reiterated the arguments that were presented in the written submission to this office and the CGRF. In response to a query by the Ombudsman regarding whether the site verification report conducted prior to the release of the connection in question mentions Khasra No.1/22 or Khasra No.1/23/1, given that both are located under the same plot no.1030, and how many connections have been installed there, the officer present stated that no connection was found at the site during the visit, and outstanding dues were also verified. Furthermore, when asked by the Ombudsman about the basis on which a Long Term Temporary Connection was granted to Smt. Kailaso (R-2) on 17.03.2022, which continues to supply electricity in contravention of Regulation 16 of DERC Regulation, the officer present stated that during the site visit, one room was found at site. Therefore, based on the submission of the requisite documents, a temporary connection was granted to her for construction purposes. However, the Respondent did not provide a convincing explanation for the reasons behind its continuous extension. Additionally, no satisfactory response was given regarding the Appellant's assertion concerning the stolen meter (RC - Anand Sharma) and the current status of that meter. The Advisor (Engineering) enquired from the Discom of commercial feasibility under which disconnected/dormant/duplicate connections could be checked, however, no convincing response was given by the Respondent. Moreover, in response to a query from the Secretary regarding the existence of adjoining plots on either side of the Appellant's premises, the Respondent answered in the affirmative.

12. During the hearing, the Ombudsman highlighted that the Respondent has not adhered to due diligence in this matter, necessitating a review to determine whether the construction work has been completed or is still ongoing for the purpose of verifying the use of the temporary connection.

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

- (a) Tehsildar (Civil Lines) office of SDM (Civil Lines) has cleared property title of Khasra no 1/22, D-1030, D-Block, Gali No.10, Nathupura, Budh Bazar Road, Burari, Delhi - 110084, in favour of Mr Parshuram on Dated 31.12.2020, supported with land record. However, Shri Amit Sharma has challenged the order with the Deputy Commissioner, Central District, vide appeal no 01/2021 to maintain status quo of property which has been accepted on 26.03.2021.
- (b) Against aforesaid Tehsildar (Civil Lines) order of the years 2019 & 2020 in favor of Mr Parshuram, Mr Amit Sharma has filed Civil Suit



vide CS No 341/21 in court of Civil Judge (North Rohini). Court, in its order dated 05.03.2021, has restrained Mr Parshuram to raise any kind of construction over the suit property till the NDOH & said suit is not yet adjudicated.

- (c) In the disputed property defendant Mr Parshuram has obtained long term temporary electric connection by concealing the facts of property dispute.
- (d) Long term temporary connection is alive in contravention of the possession of Sub Regulation 16 of DERCS Supply Code 2017.

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

- (i) CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 14.08.2025 is modified and Respondent is directed to review the released long term temporary connection in view of the points mentioned at 13 (a), (b), (c) & (d) supra.
- (ii) Outstanding dues, if any, against CA No.60017107875 (RC - Anand Sharma) be checked for recovery of dues.
- (iii) Action Taken Report (ATR) be shared within the office in next 30 days.

15. 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 DERCS Notification dated 24.06.2024.

The case is disposed off accordingly.



(P.K. Bhardwaj)
Electricity Ombudsman
11.02.2026