

OFFICE OF THE 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 No.: 011-26144979)

(Appeal against the CGRF-TPDDL's order dated 12.12.2023 in CG No. 124/2023)

IN THE MATTER OF

Shri Dheeraj Pratap Sirohi

Vs.

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.

Present:

Appellant : Shri Dheeraj Pratap Sirohi, in person.

Date of Hearing: 24.01.2024

Date of Order: 25.01.2024

ORDER

1. Shri Dheeraj Pratap Sirohi, H.No.629, Pocket-2, Sector A-10, Narela, Delhi – 110040, has filed an appeal dated 01.01.2024 against the order of the Forum (CGRF-TPDDL) dated 12.12.2023 passed in CG No.124/2023. The Applicant has requested for providing all the documents in respect of the person "Ramji Lal", in whose name the meter (CA No.60009258306) was installed at the above premises.

2. The Discom, in their reply dated 04.12.2023 before the CGRF on the Complaint, had invited attention to the aspect that the subject connection was been registered in the name of Shri Ramji Lal, resident of Narela on the basis of documents submitted in 2010. The petitioner is neither a "Complainant" within the meaning of Regulation 3 (4) of DERC (Forum for Redressal of Grievances of the Consumers and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2018 nor a "Grievance" within the meaning of Regulation 3 (7) supra has been raised, mentioning *any fault, imperfection, shortcoming or inadequacy in the quality, nature and manner of performance which has been undertaken to be performed by a Distribution Licensee in pursuance of a license, contract, agreement or under the extant SOP Regulation which are within the jurisdiction of the Forum or Ombudsman, as the case may be.*




The Discom further stated that the petitioner is disputing the release of connection, after a lapse of 13 years ostensibly on account of pendency of some dispute in the Court of Law with the Registered Consumer.

3. The CGRF observed that the documents were submitted by Shri Ramji Lal (Registered Consumer) and since the Complainant failed to prove that he is either the owner or occupier of the premises, he was not entitled to any relief, as claimed by him. It could not be said that he was aggrieved by any act or inaction by the Respondent / Discom.

4. During the course of hearing on 24.01.2024, an opportunity was provided to the Applicant to satisfy the condition laid-down in the DERC (Forum for Redressal of Grievances of the Consumers and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2018, particularly the definition of "Complainant" and "Grievance". In response to a query whether the Applicant has any proof for his occupancy to meet the category of complainant, the Applicant submitted that he is in possession of the subject premises since 2017, and all the electricity bills had been paid by him regularly through electronically except from the last few months, after being charged under SC/ST (POA) Act. In this regard, the Applicant shared details of few bills which were taken on record.

5. After listening to the contention of the Applicant and also perusing the provisions of DERC's Regulations, 2018, on the issue, this court is of considered opinion that the Applicant could be considered as a 'complainant' and there is a grievance of name change in the connection while taking wider interpretation of the definition of grievance. Yet the complainant lacks locus standi to claim any relief before the Ombudsman on the issue. The change of name/address could only be raised by the registered consumer, which he is not. Further, in respect of any matter regarding title to the property pending before a court of law, this Court has no jurisdiction to entertain any objection or provide any Redressal. With regard to removal of word "DDA Flat" from the electricity bill, this grievance can only be raised by the registered consumer only, hence, not maintainable.

6. With these observations, the appeal is disposed off at admission stage.


(P. K. Bhardwaj)
Electricity Ombudsman
25.01.2024