



\$~42

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

+ **W.P.(C) 9055/2024**

K. L. MANHAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr Satya Ranjan Swain, CGSC with
Mr Kautilya Birat, Mr Ankush
Kapoor & Mr Vishwadeep,
Advocates for R-1 and 3.
Mr. Buddy Ranganathan, Sr.
Advocate with Mr. Anupam, Mr.
Nikhil, MS. Simran and Ms. Shivali,
Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

02.02.2026

1. The petitioner in the instant petition prays for the following reliefs:-

"1) To respondents 1 to 3 to take appropriate action against respondent no. 4 against whom the petitioner had made the complaint dated 24.05.2024 (Annexure-P1) for causing financial losses and mental & physical harassment through its deceitful and illegal acts and de-panel and blacklist the said respondent vendor firm in the interest of justice;

2) To respondent no.4 to lift/remove the defective material, dumped at the house of the petitioner, at the earliest and return the advance sum (Rs.4,12,576/-) taken from the latter with interest @ 12 % p.a. and reasonable compensatory damages for deliberately harassing him.

3) To pass any further order(s)/ direction(s) as deemed proper in the



circumstances of the case in the interest of justice.

4) To award the cost of this litigation to the petitioner.”

2. During the course of hearing, Mr. Buddy Ranganathan, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.2 submits that as of now, in case of any dispute between the consumer and the vendor (in supply/installation/maintenance of system or payment terms), both parties must settle the same mutually or as per law. It is his case that Ministry of New and Renewable Energy, Government of India (MNRE) / DISCOM shall not be liable for, and would not be a party to any dispute arising between vendor and consumer.

3. The petitioner, who appears in person, however submits that firstly, the agreement in question with the vendor, was prior to the issuance of Office Memorandum dated 07.06.2024. He also submits that if he has any grievance with respect to the maintenance, supply etc. with the vendor, he will take it to the appropriate forum. However, his grievance is against the respondent-DISCOM not taking any action against the vendor for non-compliance of the statutory guidelines issued by the concerned Ministry. He, therefore, submits that the compliance of the impugned guidelines is necessary in larger public interest. According to him, any violation will have to be seriously looked into by the respondent-DISCOM.

4. Having considered the submissions made by both the parties, the Court finds that if the petitioner has any grievance, which relates to non adherence of applicable guidelines by the vendor, the respondent-DISCOM must take necessary action in accordance with extant rules and regulations.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the Court deems it appropriate to issue following directions:-



- (i) Let the respondent-DISCOM to take the petitioner's complaint to its logical conclusion within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order passed today;
 - (ii) The respondent-DISCOM shall also extend the opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and any other effected vendor in accordance with law;
 - (ii) If the petitioner, thereafter, has any grievance, he shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.
6. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 2, 2026

Nc/ksr