



## BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, HARYANA

Bays No. 33-36, Ground Floor, Sector-4, Panchkula-134109

Telephone No. 0172-2572299

Website: <https://herc.gov.in/Ombudsman/Ombudsman.aspx#>

E-mail: [eo.herc@nic.in](mailto:eo.herc@nic.in)

(Regd. Post)

**Appeal No.** : 40 of 2025  
**Registered on** : 05.09.2025  
**Date of Order** : 28.11.2025

**In the matter of: -**

**Appeal against the order dated 30.07.2025 passed by CGRF, DHBVN Gurugram in case No 4909/2025**

Smt. Jeevani Devi, W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Sharma,  
R/o H.No. 873, Sector 45, Gurugram, Haryana

**Appellant**

Versus

1. The XEN/OP, Sub Urban Divn., DHBVN, Gurugram

2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram

**Respondent**

**Before:**

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

**Present on behalf of Appellant:**

Shri Ramesh Kumar Sharma

Shri Yogesh Sharma

Smt. Jeevani Devi, W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Sharma

**Present on behalf of Respondents:**

Shri Parveen Kumar Yadav, SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram

Shri Rajinder Kumar, CA, SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram

### ORDER

**A.** Smt. Jeevani Devi, W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Sharma, R/o H.No. 873, Sector 45, Gurugram, Haryana has filed an appeal against the order dated 30.07.2025 passed by CGRF, DHBVN, Gurugram in case No. 4909 of 2025. The appellant has submitted as under: -

1. That Smt. Jeevani Devi w/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Sharma is a resident of Gurugram and had a temporary connection released at his property vide House no. 873, Sector 45, Gurugram in 2019. This temporary connection was for the purpose of construction of building at the above said plot.
2. That this temporary connection had an account no. 8402689315 under SDO Operation, South City S/Division, South city DHBVN, Gurugram. That after completion of construction in 2020, I applied for Occupation certificate from HSVP which was issued to me during October 2020.
3. That to his sudden surprise, she was served upon a bill of ₹7,07,684 in 2025 against the above referred temporary connection.
4. That no Disconnection despite Expiry of Temporary Period and not any notice from department.
5. That appellant filed a complaint for redressal of his grievance before the Corporate Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN, Gurugram (hereinafter referred to as CGRF) stating the facts that a bill had been served upon him in 2025 against a temporary connection. Copy of the complaint is attached at Annexure P-1.

Subject: After CGRF order received through mail dated 05.08.2025, Representation to ombudsman electricity department for Correction of

Electricity Bill ( as per domestic tariff) and Regularization of Connection from temporary to Regular Domestic connection pertaining to Account No.- 8402689315, House no. 873, Sector 45, Gurugram

#### IMPUGNED ORDER UNDER APPEAL

That the present appeal is directed against the impugned final order dated 30.07.2025 passed by the Hon'ble CGRF, Gurugram in Case No. 4909/2025 (copy annexed as Annexure P-2).

That the CGRF has erred in directing that the Appellant is liable to pay charges at temporary normal tariff even after completion of 2 years of connection period, despite the fact that:

It is respectfully submitted that the electricity department/respondent has excessive electricity bill of approximately ₹7,07,684-00 issued to me in May 2025 under for the account number-8402689315 pertaining to my residence located at Sector 45, Gurugram without serving any notice. After completion of period of two years of temporary connection, the department kept sending electricity bills to me and which were paid by me without any default surprisingly during May 2025 i received a electricity bill of ₹7,07,684 when I enquired about this huge amount of bill the sub division staff stated that bill is issued at double rate for temporary connection. and did not issue notice for disconnection of temporary electricity meter after completion of two years nor issued PDC, hence, it is clear that the electricity department has committed complete negligence by sending the electricity bills regularly on average basis declaring the meter is faulty without issue of PDC of my connection and after about lapse of four years now, the department has issued the electricity bill of approximately ₹7,07,684-00 on the basis of double tariff, penalty etc., just to harass the applicant who is senior citizen lady of aged about 70 years having no knowledge of rules of electricity department, hence, the present electricity bill of approximately ₹7,07,684-00 is liable to be corrected on normal domestic tariff basis which the applicant is ready to pay within stipulated time. The facts of case are submitted as under:

#### Background and Chronology of Events:

1. In 2019-20, the appellant obtained a temporary electricity connection from DHBVN solely for the purpose of constructing my residential house at the aforementioned location.
2. The construction was completed in May 2020. After completion of construction and The Appellant got Occupation certificate from HSVP in October 2020 (Occupation Certificate attached annexure – P3). Thereafter, the Appellant approached the concerned DHBVN office to convert my temporary connection into a permanent domestic connection. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, my application/request could not be processed at that time due to availability of minimal staff during lockdown.
3. Subsequently, the Appellant have been receiving regular electricity bills, which she has paid promptly and in full, under the belief that my connection had been automatically converted as Regular connection. The category of connection was also printed as 'DS' in the bills issued by DHBVNL. After

completion of period of two years of temporary connection, the Appellant did not receive any notice from DHBVN office, Gurugram for regularizing my electricity connection.

Shocking Development in May 2025:

To my shock, in May 2025, the Appellant received a bill of ₹7,07,684-00. When I enquired about the huge amount of bill in the sub division office, sub division staff told me that your connection is still classified as 'Temporary', and as per DHBVN's policy, temporary connections exceeding 2 years attract double energy charges and therefore, now the electricity bill is issued on the basis of double energy charges and other charges. It is very surprising that the bill was generated from retrospectively from 4-7-2021 to 01-05-2025 for 1397 days for energy consumption of 49168 units even without issuance of any notice for regularizing of electric connection whereas the regular electricity bills were issued to the consumer. Staff further intimated that your bills were being generated under 'F' code and now reading has been taken and your account has been overhauled. That is why bill is generated from July 2021 to May 2025 and double energy charged of electricity has been imposed.

This has come as a complete surprise, and the Appellant would like to submit the following points for your kind consideration:

1. No Disconnection despite Expiry of Temporary Period:

As per HERC Regulations and DHBVN policy, no Temporary connection is allowed beyond a period of 2 years. After 2 years, DHBVN shall issue a notice to the consumer and connection should have been disconnected. the Appellant have never been issued any notice by DHBVN (As CGRF also state that S/Division failed to disconnect the temporary supply after completion of two years as per sales circular D-7/2020 in his final order). The Appellant was under the impression that connection is regularized. DHBVN Staff itself not followed that procedure and did not issue electricity bill to me after completion of 2 years on the basis of double energy charges despite that issued regular bills which were regularly paid by me. Had the correct procedure been followed by DHBVN Staff by issuing notice and affecting the PDCO, this incident would never have been happened or after passing of two years, had the next electricity bill was issued as per their office instructions (as per DHBVN's policy), temporary connections exceeding 2 years attract double energy charges then the Appellant had immediately got my electricity connection regularized and such delay of about 4 years could not be happened. – Circular of Govt. 02/2020.

2. Regular Billing and No Default from My Side:

The Appellant have paid every bill issued to me without default or delay. These bills were generated normally, with no mention or warning about "temporary" charges or categories being applicable beyond permissible limits. As a consumer the Appellant was not supposed to know about "F" Code and I don't know what is "F" Code. The meter is installed on the pole and it was/is the responsibility of DHBVN Staff to take regular and correct readings and to



issue the electricity bill as per their office instructions which were not issued by the department for a long time of 4 years.

3. Belief of Connection Conversion:

Since bills were raised under the DS (Domestic Supply) category, the Appellant was under the genuine and reasonable belief that my connection had been converted into a regular domestic connection.

4. No Malafide Intent or Tampering:

There has been no misuse or unauthorized activity on my part. The property has been in regular domestic residential use and not for any commercial purposes.

5. Specific Legal Grounds

Violation of Sales Circular D-7/2020:

Temporary connection for construction purposes cannot exceed two years, after which the utility is bound to act – either by disconnecting or regularizing the supply or to issue notice to the consumer for their fault but in this case, the department has not served any notice to the consumer.

Violation of Natural Justice:

No notice or intimation was given to the Appellant regarding the expiry of temporary status or impending penalties, depriving her of the opportunity for compliance.

Violation of Section 56(2) of Electricity Act, 2003:

No recovery of retrospective dues older than two years is permissible unless such amounts were shown continuously as due in the regular bills. The entire demand and penal charge are illegal and liable to be quashed. Reply-to-written-statement-to-CGRF-GGN.docx

Negligence and Procedural Lapse:

DHBVN's repeated issuance of normal bills without updating consumer status or advising corrective action contributed entirely to the present dispute. No fault or mala fide intent lies with the consumer.

Sympathetic Consideration:

Applicant is a senior citizen, has never defaulted in payment, and has always used the property for residential purposes. Moreover, to show the bonafide, the appellant is ready to make the payment of bill on normal Domestic charges as applicable as per rules.

Prayer for Relief:

During hearing dated 11.07.2025 as per CGRF panel electricity department will waived off my all penalty. The Appellant already submitted a representation in the subdivision office, The Appellant approached to this forum for correction of my bill.

In light of the above, it is most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Ombudsman may kindly be pleased to:

The department be directed to regularize my connection as a permanent domestic connection w.e.f. October 2020 (the date of the Occupation Certificate attached annexure – P3).

Recalculate and correct the electricity bill based on applicable domestic rates, removing all penal and retrospective charges imposed due to the “temporary” categorization.

Withdraw the demand notice of ₹7,07,684-00 which has been wrongly raised by fixing double rate of electricity.

Set aside the impugned order dated 30.07.2025 passed by CGRF, Gurugram in Case No. 4909/2025.

Pass such other or further orders as deemed fit in the interest of justice.

Allow continued supply under the proper category based on genuine residential usage.

As per section 56 (2) of the electricity of the electricity Act, 2003, limits the recovery period for such dues to two years. (Section 56 (2) attached.)

The Appellant is a senior citizen of India and a law-abiding consumer and have always made full and timely payments towards electricity consumption.

The Appellant request your support in ensuring justice and relief from a technical and administrative lapse that occurred during an unprecedented pandemic period.

**B.** The appeal was registered on 05.09.2025 as an appeal No. 40 of 2025 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 01.10.2025.

**C.** The respondent SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram has deputed Sh. Rachit Kumar, LDC under his office to attend the hearing on dated 01.10.2025 vide memo no. 2902 dated 24.09.2025.

On the scheduled date of hearing Sh. Rachit Kumar, LDC appeared on behalf of the respondent SDO and submitted reply of SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram bearing memo no. 2904 dated 24.09.2024 & memo no.2943 dated 30.09.2025 stating herein under: -

In this connection it is submitted that the consumer has applied new connection vide A&A form no G26-219-447 in DS Temp and same was released on dated 18.3.2019. The Consumer bill was generated regularly upto date 4.7.2021. Afterwards bill was issued on F code. The above case was observed in F ok case. Revised bill was generated from 4.7.2021 to 1.5.2025 (1397 days) reading 49168 KWH (3490 kwh to 52658 kwh) on ok basis Rs.707684/-. After two years tariff was revised as per Nigam Instruction. Consumer raised complaint in Honorable CGRF vide case no. 4909/2025. CGRF decided the case on dt. 30/07/2025 that account no. 8402689315 should be charged in normal temporary tariff. Accordingly, consumer's account overhaul and send to CBO, Hisar vide case id no. 915859982 which reverted with remarks "plz provide CGRF copy and XEN approval for this case". This office forwards the case to CBO, Hisar with Xen approval letter. Now the sundry is approved amounting Rs. 1,77,390/- as per CGRF order. This bill reflects in upcoming bill.

**D.** Hearing was held on 01.10.2025, as scheduled. Both the parties were physically present. During the hearing, the appellant stated that they have applied for conversion of the existing temporary connection into the permanent connection during the COVID period after the completion of their construction work and after

obtaining occupation certificate. But failed to supply the acknowledgment of the letter.

Respondent SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram is directed to check the availability of the application in the record of the sub division and also check whether the ibid consumer has applied online for release of the new connection against the said premises in the portal of DHBVN in compliance to the instructions issued. In addition to above, respondent SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram is directed to supply the copy of the ledger from the date of the release of connection to till date. Name of the officers/officials who are responsible for not maintaining the ledger for the proper billing of instant temporary connection during the ibid period (nearly 4 years and exactly 1397 days) be also intimated. The report may be submitted to this office within 7 days from the date of issue of this order.

Therefore, the case is adjourned and shall now be heard on 30.10.2025.

**E.** In compliance to the above interim order respondent SDO vide his letter bearing memo no. 2955-56 dated 01.10.2025 submitted as under: -

In this connection it is intimated that consumer has not applied for permanent connection online against the said premises in the portal of DHBVN and neither he gives any representation to this office. The copy of ledger from the release of connection to till date is hereby attached.

This is for your information and necessary action please.

**F.** The respondent SDO in compliance to the email dated 17.11.2025 made by this office has replied as under: -

In this connection, it is submitted that this office has already made the required report in the compliance with the interim order dated 01.10.2025 vide this office memo no. 2955-56 dated 01.10.2025 (copy enclosed). The ledger copy is also attached for your kind reference. Therefore, it is requested that the hearing may kindly be rescheduled to 28.11.2025 as already communicated.

**G.** In response to query raised by Electricity Ombudsman regarding the name of the officers/officials responsible for continuous average billing of the consumer for more than 1300 days. The respondent SDO vide his memo no. 3235-36 dated 18.11.2025 submitted as under: -

In continuation of this office Memo No. 3226-27 dated 18.11.2025, and as per your office email, the name and time period of the concerned officials who are responsible for billing are given below:

Sr. No.	Name of official	Working Time Period
1	Sh. Dalbir Mor. CA	04/07/2021 to 12/04/2023
2	Sh. Rajender Kumar CA	12/04/2023 to till date
3	Sh. Lalit LDC	16/09/2021 TO 08/2022 (was maintaining ledger, till bifurcation of this Sub Division)

The office orders dated 13/04/2021 and 12/04/2023 are attached for your reference.



This is submitted for your kind information and necessary action, please.

**H.** Hearing was held on 28.11.2025, as rescheduled. Both the parties were physically present. During the hearing the reply submitted by SDO vide his office memo no. 3235-36 dated 18.11.2025 and reply bearing memo no. 3226-27 dated 17.11.2025 and reply bearing memo no. 2955-56 dated 01.10.2025 were taken on books and it was inferred as under: -

a) During the very onset the consumer/appellant has tried to correlate the billing status of his temporary DS connection to be converted to normal DS connection with the occupation certificate issued by HSVP authority. Respondent SDO have informed that the issuance of the possession certificate from any other department is not a binding on DHBVN as it is upon the consumer to apply for release of connection on the online portal of DHBVN but in the instant case the consumer neither applied for any connection online nor submitted any application in the DHBVN.

b) SDO operation, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram has informed vide his letter bearing memo no.2955-56 dated 01.10.2025 that consumer has not applied for permanent connection against the said premise in the portal of DHBVN and neither has given any representation to the office.

It is imperative that the consumer is required to apply himself on the portal of DHBVN for release of his/her connection. Had the consumer made any application thereof the Nigam officials were bound to act upon. In the instant case the consumer failed to apply online so he is not eligible for relief.

c) After going through the ledger supplied by the SDO in the matter it was observed that the consumer was billed continuously on average basis with status of meter as faulty. Since 07.06.2019 till 11.09.2025 as evident from the attached ledger for account no. 8402689315 in name of Jeevani Devi, 873, Sector-45, Gurugram with load 2 KW category DS.

d) Furthermore, it was observed that the respondent SDO has mentioned the name of the CA from 04.07.2021 to date but has deliberately not given the name of the ledger keeper after 08/2022 when the sub-division got bifurcated and the name of the officials who was responsible for the ledger of temporary connection post 08/2022. It is observed that the name of the present incumbent has being deliberately concealed as the official handling the ledger post 8/2022 are also responsible for the act of omission and dereliction of their official duty.

e) During the hearing, it was further enquired about the status of sundry submitted to CBO, Hisar after taking approval of Xen bearing case ID No. 915859982 vide which amount of Rs. 1,77,390/- was to be adjusted in compliance to the order passed by CGRF on dated 30.07.2025. Respondent SDO has confirmed vide his office memo no.3321 dated 28.11.2025 that the same stands approved and reflected in the bill of the consumer.

Taking cognizance on the average billing of consumer for 1397 days (nearly 4 years), Electricity Ombudsman expressed deep concern that the DHBVN official including the ledger keeper and Commercial Assistant who are actually the official responsible did not bother to get the consumer account rectified on account of which in spite of being in temporary category and that too on double tariff, consumer was

still billed on average basis. This clearly indicates lack of responsibility and commitment towards the duty assigned by the Nigam and also indicates about the hostile and indifferent attitude towards the consumer concern who has been served delivered a bill of Rs. 7,07,684/-.

### **Decision**

After hearing both the parties and going through the record made available in the file, it was observed that both the parties neither the appellant nor the respondent acted diligently and, in a time, bound manner leading to the dispute. After considering all the aspects, arguments and the documents available on record it is decided as under: -

1. Post compliance of the decision of CGRF, DHBVN, Gurugram amount of Rs. 1,77,390/- has been approved by CBO, Hisar. The benefit of Rs. 1,77,390/- stands reflected in the bill of the consumer as confirmed by the respondent SDO vide letter bearing memo 3321 dated 28.11.2025.
2. The consumer Smt. Jeevani Devi, account no. 8402689315 is liable to pay the amount of the bill (on account of temporary connection) raised by the DHBVN authority post adjustment of Rs. 1,77,390/- as mentioned in para 1 above. The bill raised (post adjustment) is to be deposited before release of any other connection in the said premises, because the consumer failed to apply for release of new connection online being mandatory to curb unethical practices.
3. Since, the consumer was billed on average reading and that too for 1397 days which is gross negligence on behalf of respondent. No surcharge shall be leviable to the consumer for the amount of Rs.7,07,684/- (i.e from the date of charging). Additionally, the consumer may be allowed to deposit the leftover amount post adjustment of Rs 1,77,690/- in 4 bi-monthly installments without levy of surcharge.

If the consumer fails to deposit amount as decided above, the surcharge will be leviable to the balance amount thereafter as per the rate chargeable by DHBVN.

4. The acts of omission and dereliction of official duty on part of certain officials has led to a bill of Rs. 7,07,684/- to a senior citizen. A penalty of Rs 50,000/- is hereby imposed on the respondent to be equally divided among the delinquent officials (mentioned in letter no 3321 dated 28.11.2025 of respondent SDO) for their act of continuously billing the consumer on average reading for 1397 Nos. days which is gross negligence, irresponsible and unprofessional attitude towards their duty.
5. The penalty amount being levied on these delinquent officials shall be got deposited in the account of the consumer from their salary within a time period of 30 days. The certificate in this respect shall be issued by the Divisional Accountant under the office of Xen/Sub Urban Division, DHBVN, Gurugram after meticulous compliance. In case of failure interest @18 % shall be levied on the individual penalty along with initiation of strict disciplinary action under rule 7 of DHBVN.

The instant appeal is disposed of accordingly.



Both the parties to bear their own costs. File may be consigned to record.

Given under my hand on 28.11.2025.

Sd/-

**(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)**  
**Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana**

**Dated:** 28.11.2025

**CC-**

**Memo No.2024**

**/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 40/2025**

**Dated:** 28.11.2025

To

1. Smt. Jeevani Devi, W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar Sharma, R/o H.No. 873, Sector 45, Gurugram, Haryana (Email [yksharma077@gmail.com](mailto:yksharma077@gmail.com))
2. The Managing Director, DHBVN, Hisar (Email [md@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:md@dhbvn.org.in)).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Panchkula (Email [lr@hvpnl.org.in](mailto:lr@hvpnl.org.in)).
4. The Chief Engineer Operation, DHBVN, Delhi (Email [ceopdelhi@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:ceopdelhi@dhbvn.org.in)).
5. The SE/OP, Circle, Gurugram-II, DHBVN, Gurugram HVPNL Complex, Near Police Line, Mehrauli Road, Gurugram-122001 (Email [seop2gurugram@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:seop2gurugram@dhbvn.org.in))
6. The XEN/OP, Sub Urban Divn., DHBVN, Gurugram (Email [xenopsuburbangurugram@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:xenopsuburbangurugram@dhbvn.org.in))
7. SDO/OP, Sub Division, South City, DHBVN, Gurugram (Email [sdoopsouthcity@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:sdoopsouthcity@dhbvn.org.in))

