



\$~89

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

+ W.P.(C) 5998/2025 & CM APPL. 27466/2025

SEEMA AGGARWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Piyush Gupta, Mr. Aditya
Singhal, Mr. Karan Aggarwal, Mr.
Atishay Jain, Advocates

versus

BSES YAMUNA POWER LTD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava, Mr.
Moksh Arora, Advocates
(M:9999061836)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

06.05.2025

1. The present petition has been filed with a prayer for quashing of the disconnection notice dated 22nd April, 2025, issued by the respondent and restraining the BSES from disconnecting the electricity of the petitioner's house, i.e., 1/4345 UG/F Ashok Marg Ram Nagar Extn. Shahdara Delhi-110032, vide CA No. 152874822.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on 22nd April, 2025, the respondent sent a notice to the petitioner, which was received by the petitioner on 23rd April, 2025, for disconnection of the said electricity connection of the premises.
3. It was stated in the aforesaid notice that the premises were illegal as per the Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD") norms.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner sent a reply dated 02nd May, 2025, and requested the respondent not to disconnect



the said connection till the petitioner obtains a No Objection Certificate (“NOC”) from the MCD.

5. It is submitted that, on the same date, an application dated 02nd May, 2025 was sent by the petitioner to the MCD for issuance of a NOC for regularisation of the aforesaid connection.

6. Thus, the present petition has been filed.

7. *Per contra*, learned counsel for respondent/BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. submits that the disconnection notice has been issued by the respondent only on account of the fact that property of the petitioner, is in the nature of an unauthorized construction.

8. He further submits that the present petition would not be maintainable, as the petitioner has an alternate remedy to approach the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (“CGRF”).

9. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner shall approach the CGRF. However, he submits that he may be granted protection, in the meanwhile, for a period of six weeks, as the petitioner is also pursuing the matter with the MCD.

10. Considering the submissions made before this Court, it is directed that the petitioner is at liberty to file a complaint before the CGRF, within a period of six weeks, from today.

11. In case the petitioner files a complaint before the CGRF within a period of six weeks, from today, no coercive steps shall be taken by the respondent with respect to the electricity connection to the petitioner, for a period of six weeks, from today.

12. It is further directed that in case, complaint is not filed before the CGRF within a period of six weeks, the protection granted by this Court,



shall automatically lapse.

13. Needless to state that the petitioner shall pay the consumer charges as raised by the respondent, from time to time.

14. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with the pending application, accordingly, stands disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

MAY 6, 2025

au