



Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum  
FOR BSES YAMUNA POWER LIMITED  
(Constituted under section 42 (5) of Indian Electricity Act, 2003)  
Sub-Station Building BSES (YPL) Regd. Office Karkardooma  
Shahdara, Delhi-110031  
Phone: 32978140 Fax: 22384880  
E-mail:cgrfbyp@hotmai.com  
SECY/CHN 013/08NK

C A No. Applied For  
Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

**In the matter of:**

BSES Yamuna Power Limited .....Complainant

**VERSUS**

Sanjay Gupta & Rajiv Gupta .....Respondent

**Quorum:**

1. Mr. P.K. Singh, Chairman
2. Mr. P.K. Agrawal, Member (Legal)
3. Mr. S.R. Khan, Member (Technical)
4. Mr. H.S. Sohal, Member

**Appearance:**

1. Ms. Ritu Gupta, Mr. R.S. Bisht, Mr. Akshat Aggarwal & Ms. Chhavi Rani, On behalf of BYPL
2. Mr. Sanjay Gupta and Mr. Rajiv Gupta, complainants

**ORDER**

Date of Hearing: 22<sup>nd</sup> August, 2024  
Date of Order: 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2024

**Order Pronounced By:- Mr. P.K. Agrawal, Member (Legal)**

1. The complainant approached the Forum on 16.04.2024 for grant of new electricity connection at 3<sup>rd</sup> floor of premises no. C-53/1, old plot no. P-30, Gali No. 7, West Jyoti Nagar, Shahdara, Delhi-94. The Forum heard both the parties at length and reserved the case for orders and vide its order dated 03<sup>rd</sup> July 2024 allowed the complainant's application for new connection with the direction to the complainant to give an undertaking that whenever MCD in future take any action, OP is free to disconnect the new electricity connection.

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

2. Against this order of the Forum, OP filed a review petition in the Forum on the following grounds:-

i) That after passing of the final order, the site of the complainant was re-visited to re-verify the subject locality and subject building on 18.07.2024 and 26.07.2024 and it was observed that property bearing no. C-53 is situated at the end of Gali no. 7 and the applied building in the same Gali is the only premises which are situated adjacent to C-53.


Furthermore, upon site visit, it was clarified that both West Jyoti Nagar Extension and West Jyoti Nagar are the same localities. From the site plan, it is clear that the applied premises are the MCD booked premises.

ii) That in the MCD objection list bearing no. EE(B)-II/SH-N/2023/D-77 dated 13.04.2023, in the description of the property at serial no. 8, it is specifically mentioned that the booked property is adjacent to property no. C-53 in Gali No. 7, West Jyoti Nagar Extension. In the site re-visit report dated 28.03.2024, the same observation was made that the applied building is the only building adjacent to C-53 and that no property numbered as C-54 was found at site.

3. We have heard both the parties in details and perused the pleadings filed by them.

4. This Forum can review the orders under Regulation 19 of the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum for Redressal of Grievances of the Consumers and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2018 which stipulates as follows:-

Attested True Copy  
Sree  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

  
2 of 12

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

Power to Review

- (1) Any person may file an application for review before the Forum, upon the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed or on account of some mistake or error apparent from the face of the record, within thirty (30) days of the date of the order, as the case may be.
- (2) An application for such review shall clearly state the matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was passed or the mistake or error apparent from the face of the record. The application shall be accompanied by such documents, supporting data and statements as the Forum may determine.
- (3) When it appears to the Forum that there is no sufficient ground for review, the Forum shall reject such review application:  
Provided that no application shall be rejected unless the applicant has been given an opportunity of being heard.
- (4) When the Forum is of the opinion that the review application should be granted, it shall grant the same provided that no such application will be granted without previous notice to the opposite side or party to enable him to appear and to be heard in support of the order, the review of which is applied for.

5. As per Regulation 19, cited above, the complainant in order to succeed in Review application should show:-

- a) Discovery of new and important matter or evidence,
- b) Some mistake or error apparent from the face of record

This requirement is in consonance with the order XLVII of Civil Procedure Code.

Attested True Copy  
Signature  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

6. The Forum perused various judgments delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and other Courts on this subject.
7. In one of the recent orders, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, on 18th August, 2022, in CIVIL APPEALS NO. 5503-04 OF 2022 ARISING OUT OF PETITIONS titled S. MADHUSUDHAN REDDY Versus V. NARAYANA REDDY AND OTHERS, examined the relevant provisions of law that governs review jurisdiction as follows:

- Section 114 of the CPC which is the substantive provision, deals with the scope of review and states as follows:

"Review:- Subject as aforesaid, any person considering himself aggrieved:-

- by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed by this Code, but from which no appeal has been preferred;
- by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed by this Code; or
- by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes, may apply
- for a review of judgment to the court which passed the decree or made the order, and the court may make such order thereon as it thinks fit."
- The grounds available for filing a review application against a judgment have been set out in Order XLVII of the CPC in the following words:

"1. Application for review of judgment - (1) Any person considering himself aggrieved -

- by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred,
- by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed, or
- by a decision on a reference from a Court of Small Causes,

Attested True Copy

by 4 of 12

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

and who, from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree passed or order made against him, may apply for a review of judgment to the Court which passed the decree or made the order.

(2) A party who is not appealing from a decree or Order may apply for a review of judgment notwithstanding the pendency of an appeal by some other party except where the ground of such appeal is common to the applicant and the appellant, or when, being respondent, he can present to the Appellate Court the case on which he applies for the review.

1[Explanation-The fact that the decision on a question of law on which the judgment of the Court is based has been reversed or modified by the subsequent decision of a superior Court in any other case, shall not be a ground for the review of such judgment.] "

- A glance at the aforesaid provisions makes it clear that a review application would be maintainable on (i) discovery of new and important matters or evidence which, after exercise of due diligence, were not within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be produced by him when the decree was passed or the order made; (ii) on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record; or (iii) for any other sufficient reason.
- In *Col. Avatar Singh Sekhon v. Union of India and Others* (1980 Supp SCC 562), this Court observed that a review of an earlier order cannot be done unless the court is satisfied that the material error which is manifest on the face of the order, would result in miscarriage of justice or undermine its soundness. The observations made are as under:

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

"12. A review is not a routine procedure. Here we resolved to hear Shri Kapil at length to remove any feeling that the party has been hurt without being heard. But we cannot review our earlier order unless satisfied that material error, manifest on the face of the order, undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice. In *Sow Chandra Kante and Another v. Sheikh Habib* (1975) 1 SCC 674, this Court observed:

'A review of a judgment is a serious step and reluctant resort to it is proper only where a glaring omission or patent mistake or like grave error has crept in earlier by judicial fallibility. ... The present stage is not a virgin ground but review of an earlier order which has the normal feature of finality.' " (emphasis added)

- In *Parson Devi and Others v. Sumitri Devi and Others* (1997) 8 SCC 715, stating that an error that is not self-evident and the one that has to be detected by the process of reasoning, cannot be described as an error apparent on the face of the record for the Court to exercise the powers of review, this Court held asunder:

"7. It is well settled that review proceedings have to be strictly confined to the ambit and scope of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In *Thungabhadra Industries Ltd. v. Govt. of A.P.* 1964 SCR (5) 174, this Court opined:

'11. What, however, we are now concerned with is whether the statement in the order of September 1959 that the case did not involve any substantial question of law is an 'error apparent on the face of the record'. The fact that on the earlier occasion the Court held on an identical state of facts that a substantial question of law arose would not per se be conclusive, for the earlier order itself might be erroneous. Similarly, even if the statement was wrong, it would not follow that it was an 'error apparent on the face of the record', for there is a distinction which is real, though it might not always be capable of exposition, between a mere erroneous decision and a decision which could be characterized as vitiated by 'error apparent'. A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is reheard and corrected, but lies only for patent error.'

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

- Again, in *Meera Bhanja v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury* (1995) 1 SCC 170 while quoting with approval a passage from *Aribam Tuleshwar Sharma v. Aribam Pishak Sharma* (1979) 4 SCC 389 this Court once again held that review proceedings are not by way of an appeal and have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order 47 Rule 1 CPC.
- Under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC a judgment may be open to review inter alia if there is a mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record. An error which is not self-evident and has to be detected by a process of reasoning, can hardly be said to be an error apparent on the face of the record justifying the court to exercise its power of review under Order 47 Rule 1 CPC. In exercise of this jurisdiction under Order 47 rule 1 CPC it is not permissible for an erroneous decision to be 'reheard and corrected'. A review petition, it must be remembered has a limited purpose and cannot be allowed to be 'an appeal in disguise'. [emphasis added]
- The error referred to under the Rule, must be apparent on the face of the record and not one which has to be searched out.
- It is also settled law that in exercise of review jurisdiction, the Court cannot reappreciate the evidence to arrive at a different conclusion even if two views are possible in a matter. In *Kerala State Electricity Board v. Hitech Electrothermics & Hydropower Ltd. and Others* (2005) 6 SCC 651, this Court observed as follows:

"10 In a review petition it is not open to this Court to reappreciate the evidence and reach a different conclusion, even if that is possible. Learned counsel for the Board at best sought to impress us that the correspondence exchanged between the parties did not support the conclusion reached by this Court. We are afraid such a submission cannot be permitted to be advanced in a review petition.

The appreciation of evidence on record is fully within the domain of the appellate court. If on appreciation of the evidence produced, the court records a finding of fact and reaches a conclusion, that conclusion cannot be assailed in a review petition unless it is shown that there is an error apparent on the face of the record or for some reason akin thereto. It has not been contended before us that there is any error apparent on the face of the record. To permit the review petitioner to argue on a question of appreciation of evidence would amount to converting a review petition into an appeal in disguise." *(emphasis added)*

- Under the garb of filing a review petition, a party cannot be permitted to repeat old and overruled arguments for reopening the conclusions arrived at in a judgment. The power of review is not to be confused with the appellate power which enables the Superior Court to correct errors committed by a subordinate Court. This point has been elucidated in *Jain Studios Ltd. V. Shin Satellite Public Co. Ltd.* (2006) 5 SCC 501 where it was held thus:

"11. So far as the grievance of the applicant on merits is concerned, the learned counsel for the opponent is right in submitting that virtually the applicant seeks the same relief which had been sought at the time of arguing the main matter and had been negated. Once such a prayer had been refused, no review petition would lie which would convert rehearing of the original matter.

It is settled law that the power of review cannot be confused with appellate power which enables a superior court to correct all errors committed by a subordinate court. It is not rehearing of an original matter. A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications. The power of review can be exercised with extreme care, caution and circumspection and only in exceptional cases.

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

12. When a prayer to appoint an arbitrator by the applicant herein had been made at the time when the arbitration petition was heard and was rejected, the same relief cannot be sought by an indirect method by filing a review petition. Such petition, in my opinion, is in the nature of 'second innings' which is impermissible and unwarranted and cannot be granted." (emphasis added)

- After discussing a series of decisions on review jurisdiction in *Kamlesh Verma v. Mayawati and Others* (2013) 8 SCC 320, this Court observed that review proceedings have to be strictly confined to the scope and ambit of Order XLVII Rule 1, CPC. As long as the point sought to be raised in the review application has already been dealt with and answered, parties are not entitled to challenge the impugned judgment only because an alternative view is possible. The principles for exercising review jurisdiction were succinctly summarized in the captioned case as below:

"20. Thus, in view of the above, the following grounds of review are maintainable as stipulated by the statute:

- When the review will be maintainable;
- Discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within knowledge of the petitioner or could not be produced by him;
- Mistake or error apparent on the face of the record;
- Any other sufficient reason.

The words "any other sufficient reason" has been interpreted in *Chaju Ram vs. Neki*, AIR 1922 PC 112 and approved by this Court in *Moran Mar Basselios Catholicos vs. Most Rev. Mar Poulose Athanasius & Ors.*, 1955 SCR 520 to mean "a reason sufficient on grounds at least analogous to those specified in the rule". The same principles have been reiterated in *Union of India v. Sandur Manganese & Iron Ores Ltd. & Ors.* (2013) 8 SCC 337.

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

- When the review will not be maintainable: -
- A repetition of old and overruled argument is not enough to reopen concluded adjudications.
- Minor mistakes of inconsequential import.
- Review proceedings cannot be equated with the original hearing of the case.
- Review is not maintainable unless the material error, manifest on the face of the order, undermines its soundness or results in miscarriage of justice.
- A review is by no means an appeal in disguise whereby an erroneous decision is re-heard and corrected but lies only for patent error.
- The mere possibility of two views on the subject cannot be a ground for review. (vii) The error apparent on the face of the record should not be an error which has to be fished out and searched.
- The appreciation of evidence on record is fully within the domain of the appellate court, it cannot be permitted to be advanced in the review petition.
- Review is not maintainable when the same relief sought at the time of arguing the main matter had been negatived.”

8. It can be seen that the substance of OP's pleading is that on the site re-visit report shows that it is the building of the complainant which is booked by MCD vide MCD booking letter no. EE(B)-II/Sh-N/2023/D-77 dated 13.04.2023 shows description of the booked property as C-54 (part), Gali No. 7, (Adj. to C-53), West Jyoti Nagar Extension, Delhi in the shape of unauthorized construction of entire building in the shape of GF and First floor with projection on Mpl. Land. OP conducted re-visit of the site on 18.07.2024 and found that Gali no. 7 is closed street and property no. C-53 is last building in the Gali.

Attested True Copy

Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

by  
10 of 12

Complaint No. RA No. 12/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

The site visit report also states that as per MCD booking list the property adjacent to C-53 is booked and it is the property of the complainant only which is adjacent to property no. C-53. Also, the premises of the complainant is newly constructed building, so MCD booking pertains to the same applied building.

9. This plea of OP for filing review is not maintainable on the following grounds:

- a) The registered sale deed submitted by the complainants clearly states the address of the property of the complainants is C-53/1 (old plot no. P-30), whereas the property booked by MCD is C-54.
- b) The property description in MCD booking is entire building in shape of GF and FF, whereas the property where complainant has applied for new electricity connection consists of parking, UGF, FF, SF and Third floor. Thus both the properties are entirely different in structure.
- c) That the site visit report of OP dated 18.07.2024 states that already a meter is installed in the subject premises vide meter no. 11456704.

Approaching the Forum for review of order at this stage is not acceptable. There is a serious lapse on the part of the OP and complainant is not liable to pay for their lapse.

10. Therefore, in view of the above examination of Review Jurisdiction and the conclusions drawn, it can be said that there is no ground available in the present Review Petition. In the guise of 'Review', we cannot entertain appeal against earlier order of the Forum.

Complaint No. RA No. 10/2024 IN C.G. No. 225/2024

Hence the review, being devoid of merit as per Regulation concerned, is not maintainable and is accordingly, dismissed.

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


  
(H.S. SOHAL)  
MEMBER

  
(P.K. AGRAWAL)  
MEMBER (LEGAL)

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

  
(P.H. SINGH)  
CHAIRMAN

12 of 12

Attested True Copy  
  
Secretary  
CORF (BYPJ)