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 – 110 057 (Phone No.: 32506011, Fax No.26141205)

Appeal No. 696/2015

IN THE MATTER OF:

Shri Subhash Singh - Appellant

Versus

M/s Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. - Respondent

(Appeal against Order dated 03.11.2014 passed by CGRF–TPDDL in CG.No.6150/08/14/SMB)

Present:-

(

- Appellant: Shri Harhangi Prasad, advocate, attended on behalf of appellant.
- Respondent: Shri Vivek Singh, Sr. Manager (Legal), Shri Manish Kumar (Manager) & Shri Aman Narula (Asst. Manager) attended on behalf of the TPDDL.

Date of Hearing : 19.08.2015

Date of Order : 27.08.2015

ORDER

This is an appeal filed by Shri Subhash Singh S/o Shri Sudama Singh, Plot No.1, Kh. No.71/8, Ground Floor, 60 Foot Saroop Nagar Road, Block-A, Kaushik Enclave, Burari, Delhi – 110084, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (CGRF – TPDDL) order dated 03.11.2014 in which his request for meter installation was accepted but conditionally. He was directed to pay a pro-rata amount of 50% of an electrification scheme involving installation of Transformer etc., ordered by the CGRF for the unelectrified area. The complainant filed the appeal stating that a demand note of Rs.5,400/- had already been paid by him on 28.04.2014 and that he had applied only for one domestic electric connection. How could the CGRF or the DISCOM then compel him to deposit the 50% cost of the entire scheme for the area.

A hearing was held on 19.08.2015. Both the parties were heard. During the hearing, the DISCOM was asked whether they would be in a position to give a connection to the complainant from the existing transformer supplying electricity to a connection 5 meters away issued to a neighbouring property located at Khasra no.17/21 and 71/22, Ground Floor, Village Burari, Block-A, Kaushik Enclave, Delhi – 110084 in the name of one Smt. Kiran w/o Shri Mahesh Kumar. Such supply would not form a precedent for any other person who may apply for similar connections later. It was pointed out to the DISCOM that similar orders had been given in other cases also where the release of connection would not be a precedent for others. The DISCOM could also issue a notice to all other applicants/future applicants that such connections cannot be given till the area is properly developed and another transformer is set up.

In the circumstances, the appeal is accepted and the order of the CGRF is set aside because the demand note had already been issued and money deposited by the complainant. This should be honoured by the DISCOM and the connection released without forming a precedent for any other applicant.

The appeal is disposed off accordingly.

(PRADEEP SINGH) Ombudsman