

**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. F. ELECT/Ombudsman/2015/673**

Appeal against the Order dated 03.10.2014 passed by CGRF–  
BRPL in CG.No.349/2014.

In the matter of:

Shri Avinash Kumar Sabharwal - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent No.1

Shri P. R. Chadha - Respondent No.2

Present:-

Appellant: Shri Avinash Kumar Sabharwal was present in person.

Respondent: Shri Ajay Sharma, DGM (B), attended on behalf of the  
BRPL.

Shri P. R. Chadha was present in person.

Date of Hearing : 27.01.2015, 25.02.2015

Date of Order : 05.03.2015

**ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2015/673**

This is an appeal filed by Shri Avinash Kumar Sabharwal, R/o Ground Floor, F/C-82, Tagore Garden, New Delhi – 110027 against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (CGRF-BRPL) order dated 03.10.2014, dismissing his request for reversal of name from Shri P. R. Chadha to his name in an electricity connection installed at the second floor of the above premises allegedly based on fake will/documents. The CGRF had refused to intervene in the matter on the ground that the issue is one of family property dispute and, hence, closed the case.

Against this, the appellant filed an appeal that he was not satisfied with the decision.


A hearing was held on 27.01.2015. Both the parties were heard. There appear to be some issues related to property occupancy and ownership among the various parties and this had led the CGRF to decline to intervene. However, if the issue of NOC and security deposit, as required under Regulation 20 of DERC Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 has not been looked into by the DISCOM there may be need to clarify matters.

The DISCOM was asked to explain whether they have violated Clause 20 (1) (iii) of DERC Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007 which states that if no NOC is submitted from the registered consumer a fresh security deposit will have to be taken. Since the appellant insisted that connection should have been retained in his name, before passing final orders, Shri P. R. Chadha was also called and the case was fixed for further hearing on 25.02.2015.

On 25.02.2012, Shri P. R. Chadha attended the hearing. All the parties were heard. The DISCOM also submitted the required clarification as sought on the last occasion and informed that Clause 20 was not violated as the 'Security deposit' was paid in full and no NOC was required. Consequently, the matter that remains is solely one of the inter-se rights of the various parties which a civil court can decide.

The appeal is, therefore, dismissed and the order of the CGRF is upheld.

  
(PRADEEP SINGH)  
Ombudsman

  
March, 2015