



\$~37

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **W.P.(C) 12932/2024**  
**SARIKA SHARMA** .....Petitioner  
Through: **Mr. Shubham Prajapati, Adv.**

versus  
**BSES YAMUNA POWER LIMITED & ANR.** .....Respondents  
Through: **Mr. Manish Srivastava, Mr. Moksh Arora, Mr. Santosh Ramdurg and Mr. Yash Srivastava, Adv.**  
**Mr. Abhinav Sharma and Mr. Mahender Shukla, Adv. for MCD**

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**  
% **13.09.2024**

**CM APPL 53972/2024 (Exemption)**

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

**W.P.(C) 12932/2024**

1. The petitioner appears to have directly approached this Court for the following relief:-

*“a) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus by giving appropriate and necessary directions to the Respondent No.1 to install the electricity connection in the property bearing no. No. 8949, Gali No.1, Multani Dhanda, Paharganj, New Delhi, in the interest of justice; AND;*

*b) Issue a writ in the nature of mandamus by giving appropriate and necessary directions to the Respondent No.2 to grant NOC to the Respondent No.1 for granting electricity connection in the aforesaid property; AND;*

*c) pass such other or further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper.”*



2. The relief would clearly indicate that the petitioner can approach Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) in terms of Section 42(5) of the CGRF of Electricity Act, 2003. This Court in W.P.(C) 10079/2024 has held as under:-

*“13. In the case of **Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission v. Reliance Energy Ltd.**, the Supreme Court held that since the Act of 2003 has created CGRF, all the individual grievances of consumers have to be raised before such forum only. While affirming the decision passed by this Court in **Suresh Jindal v. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. &Ors.** and **Dheeraj Singh v. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.**, wherein, it was held that the CGRF and the Ombudsman has the authority to pass an interim order as well, the Supreme Court further held that Sections 42(5) and 42(6) provide a complete machinery for redressal of grievances of the consumers. The Supreme Court in the said case remitted the matter back to the CGRF for adjudication on merits. The relevant paragraphs of the decision in **Reliance Energy (supra)** are extracted as under:-*

*“33. As per the aforesaid provision, if any grievance is made by a consumer, then they have a remedy under Section 42(5) of the Act and according to sub-section (5) every distribution licensee has to appoint a forum for redressal of grievances of the consumers. In exercise of this power the State has already framed the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as “the 2003 Regulations”) and created Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman. **Under these 2003 Regulations a proper forum for redressal of the grievances of individual consumers has been created by the Commission. Therefore, now by virtue of sub-section (5) of Section 42 of the Act, all the individual grievances of consumers have to be raised before this forum only.** In the face of this statutory provision we fail to understand how could the Commission acquire jurisdiction to decide the matter when a forum has been created under the Act for this purpose. The matter should have been left to the said forum. This question has already been considered and decided by a Division Bench of the Delhi High Court in **Suresh Jindal v. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. [(2006) 132 DLT 339 (DB)]** and **Dheeraj Singh v. BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. [Ed. : (2006) 127 DLT 525 (DB)]** and we approve of these decisions. It has been held in these decisions that the forum*



*and ombudsman have power to grant interim orders. **Thus a complete machinery has been provided in Sections 42(5) and 42(6) for redressal of grievances of individual consumers. Hence wherever a forum/ombudsman have been created the consumers can only resort to these bodies for redressal of their grievances. Therefore, not much is required to be discussed on this issue. As the aforesaid two decisions correctly lay down the law when an individual consumer has a grievance he can approach the forum created under sub-section (5) of Section 42 of the Act.***

34. In this connection, we may also refer to Section 86 of the Act which lays down the functions of the State Commission. Sub-section (1)(f) of the said section lays down the adjudicatory function of the State Commission which does not encompass within its domain complaints of individual consumers. It only provides that the Commission can adjudicate upon the disputes between the licensees and generating companies and to refer any such dispute for arbitration. This does not include in it an individual consumer. The proper forum for that is Section 42(5) and thereafter Section 42(6) read with the Regulations of 2003 as referred to hereinabove.”

*[emphasis supplied]*

14. Notably, the decision of this Court in the cases of **Abhijit Anand v. Chairman Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission** and **Ashok Yadav v. BSES Rajdhani Power Limited** also aid to the similar position of law as has been rendered in the case of **Ram Kishan** (supra).

3. In view of the aforesaid, reserving the liberty in favour of the petitioner to approach the CGRF, the instant petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**SEPTEMBER 13, 2024**

*p'ma*