



\$~64

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

+ W.P.(C) 4379/2025 & CM APPL. 20154/2025

DEEP SHIKHA LAKRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Parveen Kumar, Mr. Amanpriya
Singh, Mr. Sunny Vashisht, Advs.
Mobile- 8851135188
Email-awoffice.parveen@gmail.com

versus

TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LTD.
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manish Srivastava, Mr. Moksh
Arora, Yash Srivastav, Mr. Amit
Singh, Advs.
Mobile- 99990611836
Email-moksh@kdatta.in

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

07.04.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondent no.1/Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd., to restore the electricity connection of the premises of the petitioner, and to cancel the final bill dated 20th February, 2025, with respect to the property bearing *House No. 10, BLK-F, Jain Colony, Naresh Enclave City, Delhi.*

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that house in question, has been under renovation since July-August, 2024, and the said renovation remains in progress, till date. Thus, it is submitted that during this period, there has not been much electricity usage, as the petitioner and her family members, had been residing at a nearby property. It has further been submitted that the petitioner and the four family members, including, two children moved into newly renovated house of the petitioner only in the



end of the January, 2025. Thus, it is submitted that the electricity connection be restored.

3. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1, i.e., Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd., on advance notice, has handed over a copy of settlement between the parties before the National Lok Adalat. He submits that a sum of Rs. 2,26,400/- was payable for the electricity in the property in question. Before the Lok Adalat, the said bill was settled for Rs.1,05,000/-. The said order of Lok Adalat dated 08th March, 2025, is reproduced as under:

(Handwritten: 7/05)

ORDER OF SETTLEMENT BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT*
IN COMPLIANCE OF OFFICE ORDER NO. DLSA/ADR/SLA/2023/2074-2084
DATED 26-03-2023 AS PASSED BY DLSA,
THE PRESENT CASE HAS BEEN TAKEN UP FOR SETTLEMENT

CO-CHAIRMAN: Mr. S.S. Kishore CHAIRPERSON, LOK ADALAT
Mr. Anura Vir Singh MEMBER
Mr. Pawan Kumar MEMBER

IN THE MATTER OF:

EPLA-DNLA/358/2025	CA No.	00022/69217	KAC FND	245705
<i>Shaharajda Sahas</i>	Vs	Tata Power - DDL		

Dated : 08.03.2025/NLA

Report: For the Petitioner : *Sh. P. Sahas*
For the Respondent : Mr. Anand Nishi, Sr. Manager, (Legal) along with Mr. Anand Kumar, A.M. (Legal)

ORDER

Dispute:

The impugned DT/DAL bill as produced by the officials of respondent is for a sum of Rs. 2,26,400/- raised on the basis of above mentioned KAC file No. The petitioner/ learned Counsel/ADR prays for settlement to buy power.

It is submitted by the petitioner that he has not consumed any theft. Further, he is in financial constraint and has not filed to clear the impugned bill after getting the return as per company policy. However he is ready to pay the theft bill if extra return is allowed by NLA.

At this stage it is submitted by Sh. Anand Nishi, that the present case is booked as per law and can be settled only as per the prevailing policy of the respondent.

Order:

After hearing both the parties and considering the social and financial condition of the petitioner, extra return is granted and we direct & expedient to direct the petitioner to make the payment of 1,05,000/- against the amount of the impugned bill on the following terms:

Order of settlement before National Lok Adalat registered by DLSA



S.No.	Date	Instalment Amount	Mode
	18.03.2025	1,05,000/-	DD
			CASH/DEBIT/CREDIT/NEFT

• That in case of Cheque bouncing, the handling charges shall be borne by consumer.
 • That after deposit of the amount ordered / first instalment, the electricity may be reconnected / grant new connection (whichever is applicable) subject to completion of commercial formalities by the petitioner.
 • That this order is subject to the condition that the petitioner has not settled the engaged bill number to any Forum/Court and the petitioner/occupant of the premises in question has not been convicted by any Court of Law in respect of the engagement.
 • That the petitioner shall withdraw all pending litigation / case / dispute filed or pending before any Court / Government / Tribunal / Forum / Authority etc. and shall not initiate the same in future.
 • That if the petitioner fails to comply with any/all terms of this order passed today, the petitioner shall be liable to pay the pending amount / remaining amount, forthwith along with the cost of the application and disconnection without giving any further notice.

Order:
 It is directed to all concerned that in case of any failure on the part of the petitioner to make the payment in compliance of this Order, then the respondent shall be at liberty to disconnect the electricity supply without giving any further notice and the respondent will be legally entitled to initiate legal proceedings before the concerned Court as per provision of Section 228 (1) of Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987.

In view of these directions, the case is disposed of.

A copy of this order be given Read in His presence and after doing the needful, file be consigned to Record Room.

A copy of this order be supplied to the parties for compliance, file be consigned to Record Room.

(INDRA VIR SINGH)
 Member

(PAWAN KUMAR)
 Member

(B.H. CEDRA)
 Chairperson, National Lok Adalat
 Former Principal Judge
 Family Court (HQs)

Certified to be true and correct copy of the Award passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat.
 Ds. [Signature]
 Authorized Officer

Dated: 08.03.2025/NLA

Order of settlement before National Lok Adalat organized by NALSA

4. Thus, it is the stand of the learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1, that the aforesaid settled amount of Rs.1,05,000/- towards the electricity, has not been paid by the petitioner. Therefore, the electricity connection, has been disconnected.

5. In response, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the Settlement Agreement has not been signed by the petitioner, but her mother-in-law. He submits that the mother-in-law of the petitioner, is not the registered owner. Therefore, she was not entitled to enter in any settlement.

6. Upon query by this Court, as to why the petitioner did not attend the National Lok Adalat, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits



that the petitioner had to accompany her children to their school. Therefore, she could not attend the Lok Adalat.

7. Having heard the learned counsel for both the parties, it is clear that on behalf of the petitioner, the settlement has already been entered and in lieu of electricity bill of Rs. 2,26,400/-, settlement for payment of Rs.1,05,000/-, has been entered.

8. This Court further notes that the electricity bills of Rs. 2,26,400/-, as raised by the respondent no.1, has been challenged by the petitioner for the first time in the present petition, before this Court.

9. This Court also notes the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1, that for challenging the dispute involving the theft of the electricity from the electricity meter, the petitioner would have to agitate such question before the competent Civil Court. He thus, submits that the present writ petition, would not be maintainable.

10. For this purpose, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1 relies upon the order dated 7th April, 2022, passed in *W.P.(C) 5781/2022*.

11. Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relies upon the order dated 25th June, 2013 passed by Supreme Court in the case of ***Dr. Meena Chaudhary @Meena P.N. Singh versus BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. & Ors., W.P.(Crl)103/2013***, in order to submit that the electricity of supply, ought to be restored immediately.

12. Considering the submissions before this Court, this Court is of the view that the present petition with respect to the disputed questions of facts, would not be maintainable before this Court, and that the petitioner ought to approach the competent Civil Court of jurisdiction.

13. On pointed query by this Court, as to whether the petitioner is agreeable to pay 50% of the amount, as settled before the National Lok



Adalat, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, had sought pass-over for seeking instructions.

14. Upon pass-over, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is agreeable to pay 50% of the aforesaid amount, and seeks some time for the same.

15. Accordingly, it is directed that upon the petitioner depositing the sum of ₹ 52,500/- with the respondent no.1- Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd., within a period of two weeks from today, the aforesaid connection for the property in question, i.e., *House No. 10, BLK-F, Jain Colony, Naresh Enclave City, Delhi, CA No. 60022169217*, shall be restored.

16. It is clarified that the present order has been passed, without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties, including, the respondents.

17. It is further clarified that the present order has been passed only by way of an interim protection to the petitioner, so that the electricity connection of the premises in question, are restored without delay.

18. The present protection shall be valid for a period of eight weeks from today, within which the petitioner is directed to file appropriate civil proceedings challenging the bill, as raised by the respondent no.1- Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.

19. It is clarified that in case the petitioner does not file appropriate civil proceedings within a period of eight weeks from today, the respondent no. 1- Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd., would be at liberty to take appropriate action, as per law.

20. Upon payment of interim amount as directed by this Court, the electricity connection, in the premises in question, shall be restored.

21. It is directed that the petitioner shall pay the requisite charges, as demanded by respondent no. 1, including, the consumption charges



regularly. In case the petitioner does not pay the consumption charges, the respondent shall be at liberty to take appropriate action.

22. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, along with the pending application, is disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

APRIL 7, 2025

Pallavi/au