



\$~51

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2753/2026, CM APPL. 13368/2026, CM APPL. 13369/2026
& CM APPL. 13370/2026**

RIDLEY LIFE SCIENCE PVT LTD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Anshuman Sharma, Mr. Kartikey
Kumar, Mr. Azaz Ahmed and Mr.
Sidhant Thakur, Advocates.

versus

**TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LIMITED
& ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava, Mr.
Moksh Arora, Mr. Santosh Ramdurg
and Ms. Charu Roy, Advocates for
R-1 with Mr. Amit Singh, AGM
Legal.
Mr. Anirudh Dusaj, Advocate for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

27.02.2026

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:-

- i. issue a Writ of mandamus/certiorari directing the Respondents to quash the Final Assessment Order dated 15.04.2025 (Annexure P-1) and the Internal Provisional Order of Assessment under Section 126 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 dated 20.02.2025 (Annexure P-2) and all consequent excess billing to the Petitioner; and
- ii. an appropriate writ and order in favor of the Petitioner for refund of the amount of Rs. 10 lacs (including any additional amount), provisionally paid by the Petitioner, due to the illegal and arbitrary impugned orders issued by the Respondent No. 1; and



- iii. an appropriate writ and order in favor of the Petitioner for suitable compensation of business losses, not limited to Rs. 10.16 Lacs actually incurred, and further losses, caused due to the illegal and arbitrary impugned orders issued by the Respondent No. 1; and

2. Mr. Anshuman Sharma, counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner company, submits that the final assessment order is based on an inspection, which never took place. He further submits that the final assessment order, even though dated 15th April, 2025, was not supplied to the petitioner at the relevant time, but was supplied only after this Court passed an order on 23rd December, 2025 in W.P.(C) 81747/2025 filed by the petitioner.

3. Mr. Manish Srivastava, counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the present writ petition is not maintainable and the proper remedy for the petitioner would be to invoke the appellate remedy prescribed under Section 127 of the Electricity Act, 2003 (hereinafter 'Act').

4. For the sake of convenience, Section 127 of the Act is set out below:

"127. Appeal to Appellate Authority.–

(1) Any person aggrieved by the final order made under section 126 may, within thirty days of the said order, prefer an appeal in such form, verified in such manner and be accompanied by such fee as may be specified by the State Commission, to an appellate authority as may be prescribed.

(2) No appeal against an order of assessment under sub-section (1) shall be entertained unless an amount equal to half of the assessed amount is deposited in cash or by way of bank draft with the licensee and documentary evidence of such deposit has been enclosed along with the appeal. "

...

5. Section 127 of the Act provides a statutory appellate remedy to any person aggrieved by a final assessment order passed under Section 126 of the Act, subject to compliance with the conditions prescribed therein.



6. In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of while giving liberty to the petitioner to assail the assessment orders by way of a statutory appeal. The fact that the petitioner claims that he was not supplied with the copy of the assessment orders in a timely manner shall be taken into account while deciding the application for condonation of delay.

AMIT BANSAL, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2026

Vivek/-