



## Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

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

F.11 (1989)/DERC/2022-23

### **Petition No. 32/2022**

Under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

**In the matter of:**

**Uma Jain**

.....**Petitioner**

**Versus**

**BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.**

**Through its: CEO**

.....**Respondent**

**CORAM:**

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Shabihul Hasnain 'Shastri', Chairperson**

**Hon'ble Dr. A.K. Ambasht, Member**

**Appearance:**

**1. Shri Sanjeev Jain, for the Petitioner.**

**2. Shri Manish Kumar Srivastava, Advocate for the Respondent**

### **ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 29.11.2022)

(Date of Order: 29.11.2022)

1. Heard Shri Sanjeev Jain, who is appearing for his mother. He is not a Counsel. The main grievance of Shri Sanjeev Jain appears to be that the opposite parties are not granting a fresh electricity connection in the name of his mother. He has been running from pillar to post, but on one pretext or the other, the BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. (BYPL) is dilly dallying the matter and as such, the electricity connection have not been granted to her. He has also stated that he along with his mother has gone to the office of BYPL number of times and on one occasion the biometrics of his mother were also checked and taken by the official of the opposite party. Later on, a bill which is not connected to him was also raised and it was stated that unless the bill is paid, the connection will not be given. It has also been mentioned that the opposite party has insisted for producing an Adhaar

Card for identification of his mother who is supposedly the new consumer. He has stated that Adhaar is not a document which can be exclusively insisted upon by any company or the agency of the Government for any purposes which is a right of a citizen. He has referred that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed in the Right to Privacy judgement that Adhaar has only a purpose of identification and it cannot be forced upon any citizen or any other parties.

2. The Petitioner is aggrieved that any other document by which the identity of his mother can be ascertained is not being accepted by the BYPL, despite Regulations issued by DERC. Broadly speaking, he is aggrieved by the attitude of the opposite party which instead of providing electricity connection which is a basic right of every citizen living in a civilized society. The opposite party is harassing him and he is yet to get a connection from them.
3. We have patiently heard the Petitioner and her grievances as enumerated in the Petition as well as argued orally before the Commission. At this juncture, we are unable to give any finding on the merits of the argument or the facts mentioned in the Petition. We are also aware and of the view that the CGRF is a statutory body where the grievances of the Petitioner can be very well looked into. It is specifically constituted and designed for looking into the grievances of the consumer or would be consumer and after hearing the reply of the Discom, order for a electricity connection to be issued. The said Court can hear the parties in person, take evidence and examine the matter in detail.
4. We find that under these circumstances, it will be appropriate that the Petitioner may be directed to approach the CGRF by filing appropriate Petition before it. We also provide that in case the Petitioner approaches the CGRF, the CGRF shall strive to pass appropriate orders within a maximum period of three months from the date the Petition is filed before them. It is also clarified that three months is an outer limit and it will not restrict the CGRF to finalise the matter, if possible, earlier than that. With these observations the Petition is disposed of.

**Sd/-**  
**(Dr. A.K. Ambasht)**  
**Member**

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