



C A No. Applied for
Complaint No. 131/2024

In the matter of:

Leela Rani

.....Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

.....Respondent

Quorum:

1. Mr. Nishat Ahmad Alvi (CRM)
2. Mr. P.K. Agrawal, Member (Legal)
3. Mr. S.R. Khan, Member (Technical)
4. Mr. H.S. Sohal, Member

Appearance:

1. Mr. Vinod Kumar, Counsel of the complainant
2. Ms. Ritu Gupta, Ms. Chhavi Rani & Mr. Akshat Aggarwal On behalf of BYPL

ORDER

Date of Hearing: 11th June, 2024

Date of Order: 02nd July, 2024

Order Pronounced By:- Mr. Nishant A Alvi Member (CRM)

1. As per the complaint, the complainant applied for a temporary electricity connection on her premises bearing no. D-1/576-C, Plot No. 1, G/F, Kh. No.39/5/2, Khatoni No. 103/92, Gali No. 17-A, Harsh Vihar, Mandoli, Delhi-110093 vide order no. 8006776231. The Said request of the complainant was rejected on the ground that the gali, in which the connection was applied for, is un-electrified gali and the connection in the said premises can be given only if the

Attested True Copy


Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)

   1 of 4

Complaint No. 131/2024

complainant provides ESS space for installation of its network for the purpose of providing connections in that gali.

2. OP in its reply briefly stated that that the present complaint has been filed by the complainant against rejection of her request no. 8006776231 for temporary connection in premises no. D-1/576-C, Plot No. 1, G/F, Kh. No.39/5/2, Khatoni No. 103/92, Gali No. 17-A, Harsh Vihar, Mandoli, Delhi-110093. It further states that the subject Gali is totally un-electrified. This area is of approximately 1700 square yards in which plotting has been done. As such it is necessary that developer provide space for electricity network. Reply also states that prior to it, six more requests for new connection has also stands rejected for want of electrification of the area. Regarding existing electricity connection bearing CA No. 101578154 reply states that it was granted in the year 2006 when there was no. plotting. Even otherwise that connection has also been disconnected in the year 2023.
3. Rejoinder filed by counsel for the complainant refuted the contentions of the respondent as averred in their reply specifically denying that area is non electrified area. Further stating that even the applied premises was having an electricity connection vide CA No. 101578152 which the complainant has since surrendered as she had to reconstruct the property and it was only for the purpose of reconstruction that a temporary connection as applied for was required. Regarding the objection of area being non-electrified the complainant states that there exists pole at 15 meter distance.

Attested True Copy


Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)



2 of 4

Complaint No. 131/2024

4. In support their respective contentions complainant has placed on the record copy of a bill relating to CA No. 101578154 and as well as Photograph of the premises on the other hand OP filed rough sketch of the site.
5. Arguments heard and perused the record.
6. Going through the pleadings main contention of the OP is that there is no electricity network in the gali, applied premises exists in. Therefore OP is not able to provide connection. For that purpose ESS space is required so that it can install its network there. On the other hand complainant states that in this very premises OP has already provided electricity from a 15 meter away pole and she can be provided connection from that very pole and there is no necessity of installation of extra network. Even otherwise she is having a small plot of 168 sq. yards and how she can provide required space.
7. From analysis of facts we observe that as a matter of fact complainant by following due procedure bonafide, surrendered already existing connection and required temporary connection for re-construction of the premises. Therefore, OP's plea of no network in the said area does not sound reasonable. No doubt for providing six connection as pleaded by OP, so rejected on the ground of no network may be reasonable as for providing so many connections more network may be required. But in the present case OP was already providing electricity from that very network and it may be a sort of restoration of same connection. On the basis of aforesaid findings we are of considered view that OP has wrongly rejected the request of the complainant for temporary connection on the pretext of requirement of ESS space.

Attested True Copy


Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. 131/2024


ORDER


Complaint is allowed. OP is directed to grant the temporary connection in Premises No. D-1/576-C, Plot No. 1, G/F, Kh. No.39/5/2, Khatoni No. 103/92, Gali No. 17-A, Harsh Vihar, Mandoli, Delhi-110093 of the complainant as applied by her vide request No. 8006776231, after completion of all the commercial formalities as per concerned regulations and without Prejudice to OP's right to consider technical feasibility for other connections if applied for in future.

The case is disposed off as above.

No order as to the cost. Both the parties should be informed accordingly.
Proceedings closed.


(H.S. SOHAL)
MEMBER


(NISHAT A ALVI)
MEMBER (CRM)


(P.K. AGRAWAL)
MEMBER (LEGAL)


(S.R. KHAN)
MEMBER (TECH.)

4 of 4

Attested True Copy


Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)