



\$~71

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

CNR No. DLHC010401022026

+ **LPA 671/2026 & CM APPL. 57690/2026**

PRIYA SINGH

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Ashok Kumar and Mr. Ram
Kumar, Advocates.

versus

TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LTD. Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava, Mr.
Moksh Arora, Mr. Santohs Ram
Durg, Advocates and Mr. Amit Singh,
AGM Legal.

CORAM:

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

ORDER

% **25.08.2026**

CM APPL. 57691/2026 (Condonation of delay)

1. This is an Application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 seeking condonation of delay of 5 days in filing the present Appeal.
2. Having heard the learned Counsel for the Parties, the Application is allowed. The delay of 5 days in filing the present Appeal is hereby condoned.
3. The Application stands disposed of.

LPA 671/2026

4. The instant Letters Patent Appeal seeks to challenge an order dated 17.07.2026 (“**Impugned Order**”) passed by learned Single Judge, wherein W.P.(C) 9571/2026 (“**Writ Petition**”) has been dismissed.



5. The Writ Petition before learned Single Judge was in relation to installation of an electricity connection at a plot measuring 241 sq. yards, which falls part of *Khasra* No. 70/1/2 situated in the revenue estate of Village Burari, now a colony known as Kaushik Enclave, Burari, Delhi-110084 (“**Subject Property**”).

6. The Respondent – Company has denied the electricity connection to the Appellant on two grounds. *Firstly*, the Appellant has been claiming possession over the Subject Property on the basis of a Gift Deed dated 20.02.2026. However, in respect of the Subject Property, there are two civil suits, namely CS(DJ) 140/2026 and CS(COMM) 560/2026, which are pending before the Civil Courts; and *secondly*, because on the Subject Property there already exists an electricity connection.

7. The submission of learned Counsel for the Appellant is that it is the Appellant, who is in the possession of the Subject Property for which the electricity connection is being sought. He has further stated that the electricity connection said to have been existing on the Subject Property is a bogus connection in the sense that the said connection does not go beyond the meter.

8. All the aforesaid issues involve determination of disputed questions of facts and, therefore, in our opinion, learned Single Judge *vide* the Impugned Order has rightly dismissed the Writ Petition. We are, thus, not inclined to entertain the present Appeal, which is hereby dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

9. However, it is needless to say that in case the Appellant is able to establish the possession over the Subject Property on the basis of some order or judgment by a competent Court of law, she shall be entitled to make



another application seeking electricity connection in her name and in case any such application is made, the same shall be considered and decided by the Respondent – Company with expedition.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TEJAS KARIA, J

AUGUST 25, 2026

ap