

\$~44

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 5337/2019, CM No. 23525/2019**
VANDANA SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: In person.

versus

**STATE THROUGH: CHIEF SECRETARY STATE OF NCT OF
DELHI AND ORS.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhananjaya Mishra, Adv. for R1
Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava, Adv.
for TPDDL

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO

ORDER
% **17.05.2019**

CM No. 23525/2019 (for exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5337/2019

This is yet another writ petition filed by the petitioner with the following prayers:

*“It is therefore, most humbly and respectfully prayed
that this Hon’ble Court may please pass:-*

*A) A writ of Mandamus directing the respondent
No.2 to revisit and revise all bills raised in*

CANo.60004823096, since August, 2013.

B) Direct the respondent No.1 to appoint an Assessing Officer independent of respondent No.2 in true letter & spirit of provision of Section 126 of the Electricity Act.

C) A writ of Mandamus directing the respondent No.3 to ensure that the respondent No.2 follows all the procedures and Regulations issued by them under the Delhi Electricity Supply Code & Performance Standards Regulation to safeguard the Consumers from the monopolistic respondent No.2 which is providing an essential service to the Public.

D) A writ of Mandamus directing the respondent No.2 to pay the damages to the petitioner for raising undue and exorbitant Bills as provided under Regulation 64, 65 of the Electricity Act.

E) Grant such other relief's which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of this case and in the interest of justice and equity and fair business and trade practices."

Suffice it to state that the petitioner had earlier approached the permanent Lok Adalat / ADM / CGRF (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum) and from time to time orders have been passed by the respective authorities. It is the submission of the petitioner, who appears in person,

that the respondents have not given any justification for the bills they have raised from time to time.

On the other hand, Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava states that the petitioner's grievances having been looked into by the aforesaid authorities from time to time, the petitioner cannot go on re-agitating a settled issue. Even otherwise, it is his submission that appropriate for the petitioner is to approach the Ombudsman, Electricity under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

The petitioner states that if the liberty is granted to her, she shall approach the Ombudsman. With liberty in accordance with law, the petitioner is relegated to the Ombudsman, Electricity. The writ petition is disposed of.

V. KAMESWAR RAO, J

MAY 17, 2019*/aky*