

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

Date of Decision: May 30, 2017

+ **W.P.(C) 4984/2017 & C.M.21514/2017**

ADITYA GUPTA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ujjwal Kumar Jha and Mr.
B.P. Agarwal, Advocates

versus

TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LTD.Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava and
Mr. Shagun Trisal, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

JUDGMENT

(ORAL)

%

In this petition, mandamus is sought to respondent-Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. (for short 'TPDDL') to restore electricity connection to C.A. No.60000001713 of 109 KW at premises No.B-68/2, Wazirpur Industrial Area, Delhi-110052 and in the alternative, grant separate new connection of the same load in the name of petitioner.

Upon notice, learned counsel for respondent-TPDDL submits that petitioner's application for reconnection/restoration of electric supply to the aforesaid C.A. number has been responded to by respondent vide intimation letter (Annexure P-11) and petitioner has been intimated that there is an outstanding payment against two other persons in respect of separate electric connections, but in the same premises and the breakup of the outstanding payment has been sent by respondent-TPDDL to petitioner vide Email (Annexure P-12).

Learned counsel for petitioner points out that to seek reconnection/restoration, petitioner has already made a payment of ₹1,31,343/- and it is evident from Annexure P-7. It is also pointed out that petitioner has also applied for a new connection of 109 KW load, which ought to be granted to petitioner on pro rata basis as per Regulation 15 of *The Delhi Electricity Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007*.

Learned counsel for respondent-TPDDL submits that petitioner's application for new connection would be processed within two weeks and payment already made by petitioner would be adjusted towards the new connection and in terms of the applicable Rules.

In view of aforesaid, this petition is disposed of with direction to respondent-TPDDL to grant new electricity connection to petitioner in light of the applicable Regulations and if any payment has been made by petitioner, it be accordingly adjusted. If for any reason, it is not so done within the aforesaid stipulated time, then respondent-TPDDL is required to pass a speaking order on petitioner's application for new connection within four weeks and its fate be made known to petitioner to enable him to avail of the remedies as available in law, if need be.

With aforesaid directions, this petition and the application are disposed of.

Copy of this order be given *dasti* to both the sides.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 30, 2017

s