



Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017

F.11 (1951)/DERC/2021-22

Petition No. 17/2022

Under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

In the matter of:
Sushila Aggarwal

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its: M.D

.....**Respondent**

Coram:

Hon'ble Shri Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri', Chairperson
Hon'ble Dr. A.K. Ambasht, Member

Appearance:

- 1. Shri Sukhvinder Singh Babra, Advocate for Petitioner**
- 2. Shri Manish Kumar Srivastava, Advocate for Respondent**

ORDER

(Date of Hearing:13.09.2022)

(Date of Order: 13.09.2022)

1. Heard Shri Sukhvinder Singh Babra, Counsel for the Petitioner as well as Shri Manish Kumar Srivastava for the Respondent. On the last occasion, Shri Sukhvinder Singh Babra had sought time to seek instructions from his client on the issue whether there was a settlement with the consent of the Petitioner before the E-Special Lok Adalat or not. He had claimed that the consent for the settlement was not given, only bill was paid, in order to get the connection restored. Even today, Shri Sukhvinder Singh Babra has not been able to convince the Commission with his arguments. Further, the Supreme Court Judgement he is referring still lacks citation, date or the name of the parties and it is as vague an averment as can be. The Commission does not appreciate such casual behaviour from a lawyer who appears to be quite senior by his age.
2. In reply to the Petition, Shri Manish Kumar Srivastava had filed the award of settlement for E-Special Lok Adalat. The signature on behalf of the Petitioner are legible and have not been denied. From the Settlement Order dated 27.03.2022, it is very clear that the bill in dispute which was for a sum of Rs. 1,78,413.79/- was settled for Rs. 1,02,700/- subject to the condition that the Petitioner shall withdraw all pending litigation/case/dispute filed or pending before any Court/ Commission/ Tribunal/ Forum/ Authority etc. and shall not agitate the same in future.

3. In view of this specific settlement, the case as made out by the Petitioner today appears to be a fiction of imagination having nothing to do with the concrete facts of the matter, it is accordingly dismissed. However, we refrain from imposing costs on the Petitioner.

Sd/-
(Dr. A.K. Ambasth)
Member

Sd/-
(Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri')
Chairperson