



\$~44

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

+ W.P.(C) 19023/2025 & CM APPL. 79250/2025

KULDEEP SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ramesh N. Keswani, Mr. R.
Raghunath and Mr. Arjun R.
Vachher, Advs.

versus

TATA POWER DELHI DISTRIBUTION LTD. &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar Srivastava, Mr.
Moksh Arora and Mr. Hardik
Vashisht, Advs. with Mr. Amit Singh,
AGM Legal for TPDDL
Ms. Astha Gupta, Adv. for R-2
(Through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

%

16.12.2025

1. The present writ petition has been filed challenging the order dated 30th October, 2025, passed by the Electricity Ombudsman, Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi ("GNCTD"), whereby, the Ombudsman upheld the order of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum ("CGRF") dated 22nd July, 2025.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the impugned orders have been passed in patent violation of the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission (Supply Code and Performance Standards) Regulations, 2017 ("DERC Regulations"), Tariff Orders, and the Electricity Act, 2003 ("Electricity Act").



3. It is submitted that respondent-Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (“TPDDL”) could not have unilaterally reclassified the petitioner from the Mushroom Cultivation category to Non Domestic Light (“NDLT”) category and retrospectively impose an additional liability on the petitioner, without complying with Regulation 17(6) of the DERC Regulations.
4. It is further submitted that no notice under Regulation 17(6) was ever issued. The communication dated 04th November, 2024, issued by the respondent-TPDDL merely asked the consumer to review usage and did not mention any proposal for reclassification or gave a thirty days’ notice or provide any draft calculation in terms of the requirement.
5. Thus, it is submitted that the mandatory conditions have been totally violated by the respondent-TPDDL, on account of which, the impugned orders are liable to be quashed and that the petitioner must remain under the Mushroom Cultivation category.
6. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsel appearing for the respondents.
7. Considering that respondent no. 2 is the Electricity Ombudsman, GNCTD, respondent no. 2 is deleted from the Array of Parties.
8. Let amended Memo of Parties be filed, within a period of one week, from today.
9. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-TPDDL submits that the petitioner, being a cultivator of Mushroom, is in a separate category for payment of electricity charges, as the same is considered as an agricultural produce.
10. He further submits that the cultivators of mushrooms are granted concession, if they maintain the consumption of electricity till 99 KW and if



the consumption is 100 KW and above, then, said cultivators of mushrooms cannot be charged under the Mushroom category, but under a different category.

11. Accordingly, let reply be filed within a period of four weeks.
12. Rejoinder thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks, thereafter.
13. Considering the submissions made before this Court, it is directed that the petitioner shall deposit an amount of Rs. 5 Lacs with the respondent-TPDDL, within a period of two weeks.
14. Subject to the aforesaid, no coercive action shall be taken against the petitioner till the next date of hearing.
15. Needless to state the petitioner shall continue to pay the current consumption charges.
16. List on 23rd April, 2026.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

DECEMBER 16, 2025/KR