

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Ms. Mohini Rana
D/o Shri Puran Singh
Village Shyampur, Premnagar,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

The Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Division,
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.
Mohanpur, Premnagar, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 41/2022

Order

Dated: 09.02.2023

Being aggrieved with Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone Zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) order dated 08.12.2022 in his complaint no. 94/2022 before the said Forum, against UPCL through Executive Engineer, Electricity Distribution Division, Mohanpur, Premnagar, Dehradun (hereinafter referred to as respondent) Ms. Mohini Rana D/o Shri Puran Singh, Village Shyampur, Premnagar, Dehradun has preferred the instant petition to set aside Forum's order dated 08.12.2022 and grant her new connection.

2. The petitioner, Ms Mohini Rana has submitted instant petition dated 15.12.2022, wherein she has averred that :-
- i) That she has applied for a connection on 01.10.2022 as an occupier which was registered at no..531031072002 with the respondent as per proviso sub regulation 3.3.2 (4) (a) I of UERC (The Electricity Supply Code, Release of New Connections and Related Matters) Regulations, 2020.
 - ii) That there was a connection in the name of Shri Manish Solanki with service connection no. MP21422957846 which was also mentioned in her application. He had not been paying bills from 2021.



- iii) Total dues against the said connection had mounted to Rs. 43,980.00 till 01.10.2022. As such the said connection was temporary disconnected for nonpayment by Licensee in the month of September 2022
- iv) Since then she was living without electricity, she was trying to get a new connection but UPCL officials were asking a number of documents illegally, while such documents are not required under UERC Regulations, 2020.
- v) Electricity is a basic need for living and is a necessity for everyone. UERC Supply Code, 2020 provides for giving a connection on payment of three times security, but this was not informed to her by officials of the Licensee.
- vi) That she applied for a new connection as an occupier on 01.10.2022 after she came to know about the above provision from some other source. The application was duly acknowledged, acknowledgment enclosed. The outstanding dues Rs. 43,980.00 were duly paid on 01.10.2022 by her vide receipt no. 2524502 because she had come to know that new connection cannot be released in a premises where dues are outstanding.
- vii) That she had been contacting concerned officials/SDO for granting the connection to her but they did not hear her grievance. The officials informed her that Shri Manish Solanki had submitted some Court notice/objections for not granting the connection to her.
- viii) That as per UERC Supply Code Regulations, 2020 objections can only be raised by District Magistrate/Government authorities concerned against release of connection.
- ix) That UPCL officials did their best to delay the connection intentionally and were also not giving correct information to her.
- x) That there were no outstanding dues on the premises, still her application for new connection was not processed by UPCL officials.
- xi) That even after passage of 7 days since she applied for new connection, the same was not sanctioned neither she received any letter or message from UPCL to deposit 3 times security, she therefore approached Forum on 07.10.2022 for grant of new connection to her.



- xii) That she had no option but to stay without electricity till 07.10.2022 when the aforesaid existing connection was reconnected.
- xiii) That she got a message from UPCL on 10.10.2022 that "*Dear Ms Mohini Rana your registration no. 531031022002 is holding due to consumer end pending reason land dispute. UPCL*" She has further stated that she could not understand as to how UPCL were restrained from giving a new connection on 3 times security due to land dispute as nowhere in the regulations it is mentioned that Licensee can hold or not sanction new connection on the ground of land dispute.
- xiv) That no acknowledgement of her complaint before the Forum was given even after visiting Forum office on 10.10.2022.
- xv) That she received a letter dated 10.10.2022 from the Forum regarding fixing hearing date on 04.11.2022 in her complaint which was registered as complaint no. 94/2022. Subsequently hearing date was postponed to 05.11.2022 through telephonic conversation on 03.11.2022. Knowing well that she was living without electricity the Forum fixed a date about one month later of the date of complaint.
- xvi) During hearing on 05.11.2022 she did not feel that Forum was really doing any favour to the consumer. She requested for the copy of the date sheet dated 05.11.2022 vide her email dated 07.11.2022 and also a copy of written statement filed by opposite party UPCL. It was also requested to the Forum that Shri Manish Solanki may not be made a party but the Forum himself made him a party and fixed another date 23.11.2022. Although the Forum knew all the regulations/act/rules still she was asked to submit proof of ownership, she requested the Forum to give her a copy of regulations which requires submission of such documents to the Forum, but no reply was given by the Forum, of her email.
- xvii) On arriving in Forum office on 23.11.2022 she saw Shri Manish Solanki sitting in Forum, in view of a pending case before Hon'ble High Court between her and Shri Solanki and in view of the nature of the case they both could not face each other outside High Court, she requested the Hon'ble

Forum to hear both of them separately, which they agreed but during proceedings Shri Manish Solanki was also called inside, which she could not bear and left the Forum. Although there was no intention on her part for any contempt of Court but that was just the situation due to which she was not able to attend the hearing.

- xviii) Next day she received an email from the Forum about taking it seriously and putting blame on her for contempt of Court and fixed another hearing on 01.12.2022. The Forum did not comply UERC regulations by not giving her any receipt and not giving her copy of day sheet but not passing order within 60 days from the date of receipt of complaint, but asking her to submit whatever they think without referring to any regulation/rules or Act. The Hon'ble Forum can violate all regulations/rules/act and just blame the consumer for everything.
- xix) The Hon'ble Forum passed order dated 08.12.2022 rejecting her complaint only on the grounds that consumer failed to submit proof of tenant/occupancy which is really surprising. The Forum passed illegal/unjust orders by accepting objections of Shri Manish Solanki against UERC regulations, 2020 and also violated their jurisdiction by asking to submit proof of tenant/occupancy which is against law/rules/UERC regulation and therefore Forum order is liable to be set aside.
- xx) That her RTI dated 14.10.2022 the respondent UPCL replied through letter dated 16.11.2022 mentioning "सूचना शून्य है" for these 2 points "If no provision of Act/regulations available for accepting such objections from Shri Manish Solanki then who is the responsible official for making delay in giving new connection on the ground of such illegal objections" and "under which provision of Act/regulations his office asked to submit documents other than documents provided in UERC regulation, 2020." That clearly shows that Licensee UPCL office is working on their own rules and whatever they want they can do. For reply against "Under which provision of Act/regulations was objections from Shri Manish Solanki was taken into record and the new connection was not sanctioned, kindly provide a copy of such mention in any Act/rule/regulations" the respondent has submitted 3.1.13 of UERC



regulation, 2020 which reads as follows "There shall not be more than one connection in the name of an applicant/consumer under the same category within the same premises" this reply clearly indicates that UPCL officials are not educated or trained that they cannot see the existing connection is in the name of Shri Manish Solanki while new connection was applied in the name of Ms Mohini Rana.

xxi) In reply to her query that "under whose orders/noting new connection to Ms Mohini Rana had not been sanctioned. Kindly provide copy of the noting/order of such orders" the respondent has submitted copy of JE letter dated 10.10.2022 which suggest that JE is the responsible person for sanction of new connection. While in reply to "Designation of responsible official to sanction the new connection" respondent had submitted an OM which shows that SDO is the responsible person to sanction a new connection. Thus the respondent have given the aforesaid two contradictory statements.

xxii) In the premise above the petitioner has made the following prayers:

- a) Set aside the impugned Forum order dated 08.11.2022, being illegal/unjust and against UERC regulations, 2020.
- b) Call for Forum's record as she was not provided any documents by Forum which seems like hiding truth and facts.
- c) Allow the appeal and grant her a new connection at three times security.
- d) Take strict action against UPCL officials, responsible for not giving connection to her and delaying the connection intentionally and also direct UPCL not to ask for unnecessary documents illegally, which are not even listed out in the Act/regulation/Government Orders so that other consumer of UPCL would not suffer as she suffered.
- e) Grant her compensation whatever is allowed in regulations or any relief which Hon'ble Ombudsman deems fit.

She has submitted an affidavit under oath with her petition. Documents as per annexure 1 to annexure 9 appended with the petition have also been adduced.

3. After hearing parties and perusal of records available on file the Forum was of the view that a connection no. MP21422957846 of Shri Manish Solanki is already

existing in the premises where the complainant has applied a new connection. The complainant has also admitted this fact in her complaint. In spite of providing repeated opportunities the complainant has failed to submit proof/evidence of herself being a tenant/occupier. The Forum therefore was of the view that there was no justification for the case to continue any further and they felt that the complaint was liable to be dismissed and therefore the Forum dismissed the complaint mentioning that the complaint is dismissed because the complainant has not submitted any evidence of herself being a tenant or an occupier of the premises.

4. **WS of Respondent no. 1** The respondent Executive Engineer has submitted his written statement vide his letter no. 7139 dated 06.01.2023 wherein he has submitted as follows:

- i) That the complainant Ms Mohini Rana D/o Shri Puran Singh Rana Village Shahpur P.O. Ambiwala, Premnagar, Dehradun has submitted an application for a new domestic connection on 03.10.2022, which was registered as no. 531031022002 in the office of electricity sub division, Mohanpur (copy of application and other documents are enclosed). In regard to the above Shri Satpal Tomar JE after site inspection reported that a domestic connection no. MP21422957846 is already existing in the same premises in the name of Shri Manish Solanki (consumer history of the aforesaid connection is enclosed).
- ii) Shri Manish Solanki informed to Mohanpur sub division office vide his letter dated 24.09.2022 that no connection should be given to any other person in the premises owned by him (copy of the letter and its enclosures are enclosed). Further a notice was also given by Shri Manish Solanki through his counsel on 01.10.2022 by registered post whereby he raised objections against giving any connection on his property (a copy of the registered notice is enclosed).
- iii) The UERC Electricity Supply Code, 2020 vide sub regulation 3.1.13 provides *"There shall not be more than one connection in the name of an applicant/consumer under the same category within the same premises."* He has further stated that a domestic connection no. MP21422957846 already exists in the same premises in which Ms Mohini Rana had applied for a domestic connection.



- iv) In the light of the aforesaid facts action for sanction of a connection against registration no. 531031022002 could not be taken.

5. **WS of Respondent no. 2** The respondent, Shri Manish Solanki submitted his written statement dated 09.01.2023 wherein he has averred as follows:


Preliminary objections: -

- i) The appeal is not maintainable as the facts mentioned in the appeal have not been verified by the appellant.
- ii) The documents submitted with the appeal have also not been verified with affidavit so these documents cannot be read as legal evidences.
- iii) A connection is already existing and is live in the property where the appellant wants to take a connection.

Pointwise reply to the appeal

- iv) Point no. iv, x, xii xiv, xvii, xix, xxi, xiii & xiv no reply is required.
- v) It is wrong to say that a connection was existing in the name of the answering respondent with service connection no. MP21422957846, the fact is this that the said connection is still existing and is in running condition. Payments of bills against the said connection were not being made from the year 2021, however payment of Rs. 43,980.00 was made by him on 06.10.2022 and again Rs. 2,935.00 were paid on 30.12.2022. The appellant is trying to misguide the Hon'ble Ombudsman.
- vi) Reply to para 3 of the appeal has already been given under para ii of this written statement. The connection under reference is still running. It is wrong submission by the appellant that the connection is not running from September 22 till date.
- vii) In reply to para iv of the appeal it is submitted that the appellant is making a false averment that she is living without electricity. A sum of Rs. 2,935.00 were paid by the respondent on 30.12.2022.
- viii) The facts mentioned under para v of appeal are fabricated.
- ix) Facts under para vi of appeal as mentioned are against the facts. Intentions of the appellant is to grab the property after taking a connection in her name.



- x) The averments under para viii of the appeal are based on facts and hence no reply is required.
 - xi) Averments made under para x of the appeal are not related to the respondent.
 - xii) The averments made under para xii of the appeal are fabricated and have been mentioned with the intention to give force to her appeal.
 - xiii) Para xiii of the appeal does not concern the respondent and hence no reply is required.
 - xiv) Averments under para xv of the appeal does not concern the respondent and hence no reply is required.
 - xv) Reply to para xvii of the appeal is not necessary.
 - xvi) Averments made under para xix are based on facts. The Hon'ble Forum has decided the complaint after thoughtful examination of the evidences and UERC regulations.
 - xvii) The additional submissions are mainly related with the property and disputes over it except payment of Rs. 43,980.00 against the existing connection.
6. The petitioner has submitted a common rejoinder dated 13.01.2023 against written statements of both the respondents. She has stated that the written statement submitted by respondent no. 1, Executive Engineer needs no reply as respondent has not given point wise reply of her appeal and a bare reading of her appeal can reply all the points raised by respondent no. 1 in his written statement. Regarding reply to written statement of respondent no. 2 Shri Manish Solanki, the petitioner has stated that the written statement is based on property disputes and the same cannot be agitated before Hon'ble Ombudsman, so it needs no reply.
7. Hearing from all the three parties, the petitioner and respondent no. 1 & 2 was held on scheduled date 30.01.2023. All the three parties appeared and submitted their respective arguments. The petitioner has also submitted a copy of order of Senior Civil Judge, Dehradun dated 04.01.2023 in case no. 21/2023 before the said Court. The counsel for respondent no. 2 submitted a case law of Hon'ble Calcutta High Court in a case of Samsul Haque Mollick Vs CESE Ltd. and others dated 12.08.2005, which have also been taken on file.
- 

8. All records and evidences available on file have been perused. Forum's file has also been called for as requested for by the petitioner and has also been gone through. It is a case where the petitioner has applied for a connection in a portion of the property occupied by her and where a connection already exists in the name of respondent no. 2 but the connection has not been given to the petitioner, by respondent no. 1. In order to arrive at a judicial decision in the case it is necessary and would be in the interest of justice to look into the following statutory and regulatory provisions as well as the case laws, which are attracted in the case.

- i) The occupier
- ii) The premises
- iii) Section 43 of Electricity Act, 2003
- iv) Sub regulation 3.3.2 (4) (a) of UERC Regulations, 2020.
- v) Sub regulation 3.1 (13) of UERC Regulations, 2020.
- vi) A case law of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Appeal no. 810 of 2022 arising out of SLP no. 8917 of 2019 and decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 13.05.2022.
- vii) The case law of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WPC no. 34061 of 2014 decided by the Hon'ble High Court vide its order dated 15.03.2021.
- viii) The case law of Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, in a case of Samsul Haque Mollick Vs CESE Ltd. and others dated 12.08.2005.
- ix) Order of Senior Civil Judge, Dehradun dated 04.01.2023.

9. The above statutory provisions and case laws as they effect the instant case are discussed hereunder one by one.

- i) **Occupier:** The term occupier is defined under sub regulation 1.2 (1) (kk) of UERC (Electricity Supply Code, Release of New Connections and Related Matters) Regulations, 2020 as "*occupier*" means the owner or person in occupation of the premises where energy is used or proposed to be used.




From the above definition it is clear that anybody who is in occupation of any premises is eligible to have an electricity connection. He necessarily needs not to be an authorized or legal occupier, what is required is only that he should be occupier of the premises where connection is intended to be taken.

- ii) **Premises:** The premises is defined under sub regulation 1.2 (1) (nn) of aforesaid UERC regulation as ***"Premises" for the purpose of these Regulations means land, building or infrastructure or part or combination thereof in respect of which a separate meter or metering arrangements have been made by the Licensee for supply of electricity; In case of Agriculture connection, premises means the place of source of water in respect of which connection has been given or intended to be given by the Licensee for supply of electricity.***

The word premises is also defined under section 2 (51) of the Electricity Act, 2003 as **"Premises" includes any land, building or structure.**

From above definitions of premises for the purpose of taking electricity connection by any person, the premises is simply a place or building or a structure or a portion of a building in which an applicant desires to take connection; resides or that portion is in possession of such an applicant irrespective whether a connection in the premises is already existing, however no dues should be outstanding against such a connection and any applicant can take a connection in a portion of such a building or premises which is duly occupied by such an applicant.

- iii) **Section 43 of Electricity Act, 2003:** This section of the Act provides as follows: ***"(1) [Save as otherwise provided in the Act, every distribution] licensee, shall on an application by the owner or occupier of any premises, give supply of electricity to such premises, within one month after receipt of the application requiring such supply:"*** Further it is also provided in the aforesaid section as **Grant of Electricity Supply** ***"The electricity connection can be granted to an owner or occupier of the premises. The word occupier has been defined to mean the owner or person in occupation of the premises."***
- 

The above statutory provision under the Act clearly provides that the Licensee (UPCL here) is duty bound to give electricity connection, whosoever applies for the same being an occupier of the premises where connection is intended to be taken, it nowhere provides as to what should be the status of an occupier i.e. whether he/she is an authorized or legal occupier or unauthorized whatsoever its none of the business to see the status of an applicant as an occupier, what they have to see is that one must be the occupier of the place or premises where connection has been applied for and thus connection cannot be refused to an applicant who is an occupier of a premises.

- iv) **Sub regulation 3.3.2 (4) (a) of UERC Regulations, 2020:** Proof of ownership or occupancy. Although this sub regulation provides for submission of any one document out of the documents mentioned from sr no. (i) a) to d) and also NOC from the owner of the premises where the applicant is not the owner under point e) but the proviso to the above sub regulation which is reproduced below is relevant to be seen.

“Provided that in case the Applicant is unable to submit any of the document listed at a) to e) above, then the Applicant shall be charged thrice the amount of security as per Table 3.4 to Table 3.6 of Clause (11) of Sub-regulation 3.3.3. The owner of the premises, if different from the Applicant, shall not be liable for payment of any dues against such connection.

Provided further that where the applicant is unable to submit the documents mentioned at a) to e) above and objection has been raised on the premises by District Magistrate/Government Authorities/Government under whose jurisdiction premises falls, the Licensee shall not grant new connection to such Applicant”

A perusal of the aforesaid proviso suggests that even if an occupier of a premises not being the owner of the premises is unable to submit any of the documents as mentioned in the aforesaid regulation even then the connection to the applicant has to be given on charging thrice the amount of security as per table and sub regulation mentioned in the proviso. And in that case the owner of the premises, who has not given NOC shall not be liable for payment of any dues against such connection, that means the entire responsibility for

payment of dues against such a connection given without NOC and on depositing thrice times security shall lie wholly on the application to whom the connection has been or has to be given.

The second proviso of the said regulation provides that in a case where documents and NOC as required has not been submitted by the applicant and objections has been raised by District Magistrate/Government authorities/Government, the Licensee shall not grant a new connection to such an applicant.

This suggests that connection to an applicant who has not submitted any document can be denied, if objections are raised by the government authorities as mentioned in the proviso. It therefore suggests that objections cannot be raised by any third party not being a government authority and therefore connection has to be given to an applicant despite non submission of documents including NOC and raising objections by any non government third party.

- v) **Sub regulation 3.1 (13) of UERC Regulations, 2020:** This sub regulation provides as follows: "There shall not be more than one connection in the name of an applicant/consumer under the same category within the same premises." A perusal of written statement by respondent no. 1, the Executive Engineer under para 3, referring to the above sub regulation they have submitted that a connection no. MP21422957846 already exists in the premises where Ms Mohini Rana has applied for a domestic connection and therefore action for sanction of connection to her could not be taken.

Here it is clarified that the respondent, Executive Engineer has wrongly interpreted the above sub regulation, it provides that connection for the same category to a person already having a connection for the same category in the same premises cannot be given and it does not prevents giving a connection to some other person in the same premises for the same category as is the case here.

- vi) **A case law of Hon'ble Supreme Court in Appeal no. 810 of 2022 arising out of SLP no. 8917 of 2019 and decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court**

[Handwritten signature]

vide its order dated 13.05.2022: The Hon'ble Supreme Court in their judgment in the above case has made comments as *"The Landlord cannot prevent the tenant from availing such facility at his own cost. ... It is now well settled proposition of law that electricity is a basis amenity of which a person cannot be deprived. Electricity cannot be declined to a tenant on the ground of failure/refusal the landlord to issue no objection certificate. All that electricity supply authority is required to examined is whether the applicant for electricity connection is in occupation of the premises in question."*

With such mentions the Hon'ble Supreme Court ordered that the impugned order cannot be sustained and the same is set aside and have allowed the appeal.

- vii) The case law of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WPC no. 34061 of 2014 decided by the Hon'ble High Court vide its order dated 15.03.2021: *"Electricity is a basic amenity in life. Water and electricity are integral part of right to life within the meaning of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Section 43 of the Electricity Act provides that there is a statutory duty of the distribution licensee to provide electric connection to the applicants within one month after receipt of the application requiring such supply. The 1st respondent Board is the sole distribution licensee for electricity within the State and therefore the Board and its officials shall make every endeavor to provide electricity supply to applicants without any delay. On a query made by this Court, the Standing Counsel for the Board on instruction submitted that, the 3rd respondent has been given electricity supply during pendency of this writ petition."*

Thus the Hon'ble High Court has decided the case in favour of the applicant by directing the Licensee to release connection to the applicant without any delay and as is evident from a mention in the order, connection had already been given during pendency of the writ petition i.e. the Hon'ble High Court's order stands duly complied with.

- viii) The case law of Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, in a case of Samsul Haque Mollick Vs CESE Ltd. and others dated 12.08.2005: This case law

has been submitted by the counsel of respondent no. 2 at the time of hearing, wherein the Hon'ble High Court has mentioned that *"In my opinion, the expression occupier mentioned in section 43 in the Electricity Act, 2003 shall not include an unauthorized occupant of a premises"*

A perusal of section 43 of the Act, as reproduced above shows that word unauthorized occupant does not appear in the said section, it only provides the occupier of the premises. Further in the aforesaid case law of Hon'ble Supreme Court judgment dated 13.05.2022, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has not mentioned anything like unauthorized occupier as mentioned in Hon'ble Calcutta High Court's aforesaid judgment dated 12.08.2005, it therefore appears that neither section 43 of the Act, nor Hon'ble Supreme Court's above case law supports the case law of Hon'ble Calcutta High Court.

- x) **Order of Senior Civil Judge, Dehradun dated 04.01.2023:** This is an interim order dated 04.01.2023 issued by the Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge, Dehradun in case no. 21/2023 of Shri Puran Singh Rana vs Shri Manish Solanki in which notice has been issued to Shri Manish Solanki and Mohini Rana. This is a case regarding dispute of the ownership of the land details of which are recorded in the said order and 16.01.2023 has been fixed for hearing in the case and meanwhile respondent no. 1 has been restrained from making any change i.e. sale of property etc. till the date of hearing 16.01.2023.


A perusal of this order suggest that it is regarding a dispute on the property between Shri Puran Singh Rana and Shri Manish Solanki and it has nothing to do with release of connection to the petitioner neither the Hon'ble Senior Civil Judge has mentioned anything nor has issued any stay on giving new connection to the petitioner.

10. In view of the aforesaid statutory provisions under the Act, relevant UERC regulations and case laws of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble Kerala High Court as their applications in the instant case, the Forum's order for dismissal of complaint of the petitioner before them on the grounds that the applicant for the connection has not produced necessary certificates of herself being a tenant/occupier of the property, cannot be upheld, as nowhere in the above statutory provisions and regulations has been provided for forceful submission of such evidences. The relevant regulation

provides for submission of documents ... NOC, but it further provides to give connection to an applicant on deposition of three times the security even if none of the documents as required under the regulation have not been submitted by the applicant. It is only sufficient that an applicant of new connection is an occupier of the portion of the premises where a connection has been applied for i.e. that portion is in her possession. The respondent, Executive Engineer in reply to a query by the Hon'ble Forum has submitted before the Forum vide his letter no. 6448 dated 03.12.2022 that they have already submitted their case before the Forum and further he has mentioned that it is not in UPCL's jurisdiction to decide the possession. It suggests that the UPCL does not require to force submission of any documentary evidences from an applicant to prove its occupation of the premises, where connection has been applied for. Further there is no provision in UERC Regulations or Act to deny connection to an applicant on the objection raised by a third party not being an authorized Government officer on such grounds as dispute of ownership of property, and/or a connection in the premises already existing in the name of such third party.

11. In view of aforesaid provisions, withholding release of connection and denial of a connection to the petitioner in the instant case is unjustified being in violation of relevant regulations, provisions in Electricity Act, 2003 as well as above quoted case laws of Hon'ble Supreme Court and Kerala High Court. The petitioner is entitled to get a connection as applied for under above provisions of Act and regulations. The respondents are therefore directed to arrange to release the connection to the petitioner against her application already registered with them with registration no. 531031072002 expeditiously but in any case within 15 days from the date of this order after getting deposited security from the petitioner @ three times. As per evidences available on file apparently there are no outstanding dues on the premises against the existing connection. Forum order is set aside being inconsistent with relevant regulations and provisions of the Act. The petition is allowed.

Dated: 09.02.2023


(Subhash Kumar)
Ombudsman