



(Regd. Post)

**Appeal No.** : 46 of 2025  
**Registered on** : 19.11.2025  
**Date of Order** : 21.04.2026

**In the matter of:**

**Appeal against the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 193 of 2025- Shri Surjeet Sandhu**

Shri Surjeet Sandhu, House Number-18, Sector-7, Urban Estate Karnal, **Appellant**  
Haryana-132001

Versus

1. The XEN/OP City, Division, UHBVN Karnal  
2. SDO, Op. Ram Nagar Sub Division, UHBVN, Karnal **Respondent**

**Before:**

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

**Present on behalf of Appellant:**

Shri Surjeet Sandhu

**Present on behalf of Respondents:**

Er. Dinesh Nain, SDO, Ram Nagar  
Shri Sanjay Basal, Advocate

**ORDER**

**A.** Shri Surjeet Sandhu has filed an appeal against the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in case no. 193 of 2025. The appellant has requested the following relief: -

*This is to state that Applicant holds Agriculture Tubewell UHBVN Electrical Connection Number-6488781000 at Village Dinga Khera, Karnal.*

*The Boring of said Tubewell has failed and now it is proposed to Shift the Tubewell to nearby Khewat Number-1236 & Khasra Number-13373/2850/2851/4/1 in village Dinga Khera ITSELF and same land is in name of Applicant.*

*Applicant Applied for Shifting of Tubewell Connection to SDO, Operations, RamNagar, Karnal on 07/02/2025 AND SAME IS STILL PENDING. Hence Applicant was constrained to register the Complaint with Hon'ble CGRF.*

*Appellant disagrees with the subject Orders of the Hon'ble CGRF and hence the Appeal is Preferred before Thyself.*

*At the outset it is pertinent to mention that SDO, OP, RamNagar, Karnal, did not provide the pointwise Reply to the Complaint (No.-193/2025 dated 15.08.2025) of the Appellant despite multiple directions of the Hon'ble CGRF.*

*As per the 1st Rejoinder submission by the Appellant (as contained in the attached Orders of the Hon'ble Forum), it is Prayed to take cognizance of the attached UHBVN Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 dated 27.06.2025 but no decision taken in regard. Kindly the said Circular be considered.*

*Further, as per the attached Complaint dated 15.08.2025 to Hon'ble CGRF & submission of the Appellant in attached Representation to the Hon'ble Chairman CGRF it is stated that-*

*"Vide attached Memo No.-Ch-37/CE/OP/WO/F-910/CE/C-I dated 23.06.2025 issued by the O/o Chief Engineer/ Commercial, UHBVN, Panchkula, Honourable Chief Engineer/Commercial, UHBVN, Panchkula directed the O/o S.E., Operations, Karnal*

Circle, UHBVN to arrange to re-calculate the Estimated Cost (of Appellant) in line with Minutes of Meeting of Board of Directors held on 30.05.2025.

Thereafter, the Executive Engineer (OP), City Division, UHBVN, Karnal forwarded the subject Memo to SDO, Ram Nagar, Karnal, UHBVN vide attached Memo No.-CH-146/MLA Grievance dated 24/06/2025 for Necessary Action.

But to utter surprise, SDO, Ram Nagar, Karnal, did not take any further action in regard till date. Kindly arrange to direct the concerned SDO for necessary action in regard ".

Pray Honourable The Electricity Ombudsman, H.E.R.C., Haryana, to arrange to take Action in regard please and waive off the Demand Notice as per abovesaid UHBVN Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 dated 27.06.2025.

Shall be highly obliged for the same.

**B.** The appeal was registered on 19.11.2025 as an appeal No. 46 of 2025 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 10.12.2025.

**C.** On 17.12.2025, respondent SDO has submitted reply which is as under:-

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS:-

1. That as per the complaint and statement of appellant, he holds Agriculture Tubewell UHBVN electrical connection no. 6488781000 at village Dinga Khera, Karnal. The boring of said tubewell had failed and it was proposed to shift the tubewell to nearby Khewat number 1236 and Khasra number 13373/2850/2851/4/1 in village Dinga Khera Karnal. As per the statement of appellant this land belongs to him and in his name. And he submitted an application for shifting of tubewell connection with office of sub division office, operations, UHBVN, Ram Nagar, Karnal on 07-02-2025.
2. That the appellant has alleged in his complaint that his application for shifting of tubewell connection is pending since 07-02-2025 and matter has been repeatedly brought in to the knowledge of sub division officer Ram Nagar, Karnal, but it is being delayed for one reason or the other intentionally.
3. That it is pertinent to mention that appellant has not paid the demand notice charges to the department, due to which the work of shifting of his tubewell connection is pending. In this context the "Decision para of Ld. CGRF Panchkula at page 12 (last para)" is reproduced below: -

*After examining the reply of the respondent SDO, the record available on the file and hearing both the parties, the Forum has observed that since after thorough discussions held on 03-09-2025 at Karnal, the complainant was convinced/ready to deposit the amount with the Nigam or to get carried out the same through the self-execution scheme. The Forum directs SDO/respondent to get expedited the work of the complainant within 21 days, as and when he deposits the amount with the Nigam, as per norms of the Nigam or further if the complainant wants to get the same done through execution scheme, charges as per standing instructions of the Nigam may be got deposited from him.*

4. That it is appropriate to mention here that the shifting area of tubewell connection is more than 70 meters, so charges are applicable.

SUBMISSIONS: -

1. That the appellant had submitted an application on dated 07-02-2025 for shifting of tubewell connection on account of bore failure. The appellant was seeking that the boring of said tubewell has failed and now the tubewell is being shifted to nearby Khewat Number-1236 & Khasra Number- 13373/2850/2851/4/1 in village Dinga Khera in Karnal and same land in his name but the appellant did not supply requisite documents with the application.
2. That on dated 26-03-2025 the respondent department had received an affidavit from Mrs. Palika Sandhu wherein she stated that she was submitting the affidavit on behalf of Surjeet Sandhu and stated the reason of shifting of tubewell. But, no authorization letter of the appellant was submitted to the respondent department.
3. That on 16-04-2025 the appellant had sent an Email to the respondent department for authorization of his wife and prayed for shifting his tubewell connection, which is annexed as Annexure R-1. But the appellant neither provided his consent to bear the expenses nor for providing Right of Way for erection of the new line. And no supporting documents were submitted by the appellant on 16-04-2025 along with the application.
4. That thereafter a representative of the appellant visited the office of the respondent department to know the procedure & documents required for shifting of tubewell. He was informed by the list of requisite documents required to process the case of tubewell shifting. He was also informed to submit consent from the appellant to bear cost of estimate & provide Right of Way.
5. That thereafter the appellant had submitted the requisite documents to the respondent department and submitted his consent by Email on dated 01-05-2025 stating that he will bear the cost of shifting of his tubewell connection and will provide Right of Way to erect the new line.
6. That after receiving the consent of the appellant, the estimate was sent to higher office on 05-05-2025 and as per sales circular no. U-33/2001 dated 15-03-2001, (Annexure R-2) the estimate was sanctioned by the competent authority on 15-05-2025 as per the advice received from CE/Commercial, Panchkula. And demand notice to pay the estimate cost was sent to the appellant vide this office memo no. 6813 dated 19-05-2025 (Annexure R-3). But the appellant did not pay the estimate cost.
7. That it is pertinent to mention here that there has been no intentional delay in processing the appellant's request for tubewell shifting after submission of requisite application and supporting documents. Hence, pleading of the appellant regarding intentional delay of his request is baseless and an after thought only to harass the Nigam officers and officials.

So it is, therefore, prayed that keeping in view the above contentions of the respondent department, the present appeal of the appellant may kindly be dismissed. And pass any other order in favour of respondent in the interest of justice.



**D.** Hearing was held today i.e. on 18.12.2025, as re-scheduled. Hearing was attended by the respondent counsel and SDO/Operation, Model Town physically but the appellant was not available during the hearing. Upon intervention by the official of Electricity Ombudsman the appellant submitted an email at 11:40 A.M. dated 18.12.2025 stating exemption on health issues which has been considered in the interest of justice. After going through the record made available and reply of the respondent the factum of the case are here in under: -

1. The present appeal has been filed by the appellant, Sh. Surjeet Sandhu, challenging the order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum (CGRF), UHBVN, Panchkula, in Complaint No. 193/2025. The appellant holds an agricultural tubewell connection bearing Account No. 6488781000 at Village Dinga Khera, Karnal, under the jurisdiction of the respondents. The appellant applied for shifting of the said connection on 07.02.2025 due to bore failure, proposing to relocate it to nearby land in his ownership at Khewat No. 1236 and Khasra No. 13373/2850/2851/4/1 in the same village.
2. The CGRF, after considering the submissions of both parties, including discussions held on 03.09.2025 at Karnal, observed that the appellant was convinced and ready to deposit the estimated shifting charges with the Nigam or opt for self-execution. The Forum directed the respondent SDO to expedite the shifting work within 21 days upon deposit of the amount as per Nigam norms, noting that the shifting distance exceeds 70 meters, thereby attracting applicable charges. The CGRF's decision was based on the advice of the Commercial Wing of UHBVN and relevant sales instructions, including Sales Circular No. U-33/2001 dated 15.03.2001, which requires the consumer to bear the cost of shifting.
3. In the appeal, the appellant contends that the respondents caused deliberate delay in processing his application despite repeated follow-ups. The appellant seeks retrospective application of Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 dated 27.06.2025, which provides for cost-free shifting of agricultural power (AP) connections within a 70-meter radius of the original location (provided the new site is in the same ownership), with such costs to be claimed by the licensee through Annual Revenue Requirement (ARR). The appellant appears to argue that this circular should apply to his case, notwithstanding the date of his application and the shifting distance. Additionally, questions have arisen regarding whether the proposed shifting involves a change from a rural/AP feeder to an urban feeder, and if the appellant has complied with the CGRF's directive by depositing the demanded charges of Rs. 3,75,103/- (as per demand notice dated 19.05.2025).
4. The respondents, in their reply dated 17.12.2025, submit that the application was processed promptly upon receipt of requisite documents, including the appellant's consent on 01.05.2025 to bear the shifting costs and provide Right of Way (ROW). The estimate was sanctioned on 15.05.2025 after consultation with the Commercial Wing, and the demand notice was issued accordingly. The

respondents emphasize that the shifting distance exceeds 70 meters, making charges applicable under prevailing instructions. They further assert that Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 operates prospectively from 27.06.2025 and does not apply retrospectively to the appellant's application dated 07.02.2025. Reference is made to prior sales circulars (e.g., U-33/2001 dated 15.03.2001, and others issued in 2016, 2019, and 2023) which consistently require consumers to bear shifting costs beyond specified limits or conditions, including provision of ROW. The respondents deny any intentional delay, stating that the work remains pending solely due to non-deposit of charges by the appellant.

5. Upon preliminary perusal of the appeal, the CGRF order, the respondents' reply, and the attached documents (including affidavits, emails, demand notice, and relevant sales circulars from the UHBVN website), it is observed that the core issues revolve around: (i) the applicability of Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 retrospectively; (ii) confirmation of the exact shifting distance and whether it qualifies under any exemption; (iii) the nature of the feeder (rural/AP vs. urban) at the proposed new site and any implications thereof; (iv) compliance with mandatory requirements such as ROW consent and deposit of charges; (v) allegations of deliberate delay by the respondents; and (vi) whether the appellant has taken steps post-CGRF order to deposit the charges or pursue self-execution.
6. In light of the above, and to ensure a comprehensive adjudication, both parties are directed to furnish any additional facts or documents that may assist in resolving the matter. It is therefore ordered to comply as under:-
  - (a) Affidavit from the appellant confirming the exact shifting distance (with supporting survey/map if available), details of the feeder type at the new site, proof of any deposit made post-CGRF order, and specific grounds for seeking retrospective application of Sales Circular No. U-07/2025.
  - (b) Affidavit from the respondents providing a chronological timeline of actions taken on the application (with dates, supporting records and document obtained from the appellant to process the complete case), confirmation of the shifting distance, feeder details, any internal communications regarding delays, and copies of sales circulars in 2016, 2019, and 2023 wherein the shifting charges and ROW (right of way) is required to be borne and provided respectively by the beneficiary.
  - (c) Any other relevant evidence, such as certification from the Ground Water Cell regarding bore failure/salinity, or updates on compliance with the CGRF directive.

The additional information, if any, shall be submitted within 15 days from the date of this order, with copies exchanged between the parties. The matter is adjourned for arguments and final hearing on 07.01.2026.

**E.** Vide email dated 03.01.2026 appellant has submitted as under:-

“Please refer Attachment.As per Attachment, Worthy Chief Engineer(OP),Rohtak, UHBVN, Sh Palvinder Kumar, accorded Personal Hearing to the Applicant on 13/12/2025 and he visited the Tubewell Shifting site.

Sh.Palvinder Kumar conveyed vide his attached Letter dated 23/12/2025 that the Demand Estimate of Shifting Tubewell Connection of Applicant shall be reduced significantly from the current Estimate of Rs.3,75,103/-

Now Pray is that the Revised Estimate of Shifting of Tubewell Connection be provided to the Applicant at the earliest .

Hence, Applicant hereby Pray for withdrawal from Appeal No. 46 of 2025 and he DOES NOT intend to Appear before the Honourable Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana for Hearing on 07/01/2026.Pray to Thyself for Grant of Exemption to Applicant from Hearing dated 07/01/2026.

Shall be highly obliged for Your kind consideration please.”

**F.** On 06.01.2026, SDO respondent has submitted compliance to the interim order dated 18.12.2025 in appeal no. 46 of 2025, chronological timeline of the actions taken are given below:

1. Application for shifting of Tubewell connection was received on dated 16.04.2025 through email (Annexure-1).
2. An Estimate was framed and sent to higher authorities vide this office Memo No. 6662 dated 28.04.2025. Objection was raised by the higher authorities on above said Deposit Estimate vide Endst No. Ch-05/Est. R/Nagar (Annexure-2).
3. Meanwhile consent was received from the consumer through email dated 01.05.2025 for depositing the amount of Deposit Estimate as well as for providing Right of way (Annexure-3).
4. A revised Deposit Estimate was framed by this office after attending the observations raised by higher authorities and same was sent vide this office memo no. 6688 dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure-4).
5. Deposit Estimate bearing number 21314/CDD-112/2025-26 dated 15.05.2025 amounting for Rs. 3,75,103.00 was sanctioned by the higher authority after taking advice from the Chief Engineer/commercial (Annexure-5).
6. Demand Notice bearing Memo no. 6813 dated 19.05.2025 was sent to the consumer for depositing the amount of Deposit Estimate followed by a reminder vide Memo No. 7717 dated 03.10.225 and a final notice was sent vide Memo No. 7874 dated 10.11.2025. But the consumer neither deposited the amount of Deposit Estimate nor opted for self execution scheme by paying 1.5% of Estimate cost. (Annexure-6).
7. The distance between the new and old position of Tubewell bore is around 300 Meters and same was conveyed to the appellant in answer to the RTI vide Memo No 7922 dated 18.11.2025 (Annexure-7).
8. In response to internal communication delay as mentioned in ibid interim order as well as in compliance to the CGRF Order dated 30.10.2025 in complaint no.



193/2025, it is submitted that a committee was constituted by the XEN 'OP' City Division, UHBVN Karnal vide his Office order No. 488 dated 06.11.2025, to enquire the matter and its report was submitted vide Memo no. 3077/S/71 dated 23.12.2025 (Annexure-8).

9. Copy of Affidavit and report of Hydrologist, Ground Water Cell, Irrigation & Water Resources Department Karnal (Annexure-9).

This is for your kind information and kind consideration please.

- G.** Hearing was held on 07.01.2026, as scheduled. Hearing was attended by the respondent SDO along with his counsel and the XEN/Works, UHBVN. The appellant did not appear physically; however, an email dated 03.01.2026 from the appellant was taken on record and considered. Upon review, the language in the said email appears somewhat ambiguous and open to interpretation, necessitating further clarification to ensure a fair and informed adjudication.

During the hearing, the respondent SDO submitted a detailed timeline of actions and an enquiry report prepared by the XEN/Operation City Division, UHBVN, Karnal, in compliance with the directions of the CGRF order dated 30.10.2025 (specifically point no. 1 thereof). This report, dated 24.12.2025, follows a thorough investigation involving committee reviews, record examination, and opportunity for the appellant's participation. The findings indicate that there was no deliberate delay attributable to the respondents, as the processing of the shifting application aligned with available records showing the first verifiable request on 16.04.2025, with subsequent actions taken promptly upon receipt of necessary documents and resolutions of observations.

Additionally, the XEN/Works presented a reply uploaded on the CPGRAM Portal, outlining a proposed exercise wherein all relevant connections in the area would first be shifted to an Agricultural Power (AP) feeder. Following this, the estimate for the appellant's tubewell shifting to the proposed site would be reevaluated based on the updated configuration, with the potential for a reduction in the actual cost from the original demand.

In view of the developments referenced in the appellant's email, including interactions with the Chief Engineer/Operation, UHBVN, Rohtak, and to ascertain the precise nature and implications of any resolution or revised estimate mentioned therein, it is deemed appropriate to seek direct clarification from the concerned office.

Accordingly, it is ordered as under:

- (a) The Chief Engineer/Operation, UHBVN, Rohtak (or a duly authorized representative) is directed to appear personally at the next hearing to explain the developments, including any site visit, communications, or revised proposals related to the appellant's case, along with supporting documents such as the letter dated 23.12.2025 referenced in the appellant's email.
- (b) The appellant is directed to appear personally at the next hearing to provide clarification on the contents of his email dated 03.01.2026, including his intent regarding withdrawal of the appeal and any satisfaction with proposed

resolutions. In the event of non-appearance without sufficient cause, ex-parte decision will be taken.

- (c) Both parties are further directed to comply with any pending requirements from the previous interim order dated 18.12.2025, including submission of affidavits and additional documents, if not already furnished, with copies exchanged between them.

The matter is adjourned for arguments and final hearing on 02.03.2026.

**H.** On 21.02.2026 through email appellant has submitted as under:-

This is to state that Appellant seeks exemption from Hearing dated 02/03/2026 for unavoidable circumstances.

Further, it is humbly Prayed to Yourself that UHBVN Authorities be directed to produce the Copy of Revised Demand Estimate for the Shifting of Tubewell Connection of Appellant.

As per the Attached RTI Information received from UHBVN, it is stated that the Plan for Shifting All Tubewell Connections from Non AP Feeder to AP Feeder IN OUR AREA has been Approved by the Competent Authority but the Revised Demand Estimate for Shifting Case of Appellant has not been finalized Yet.

Shall be highly obliged & indebted for Your kind Direction please.”

**I.** On 05.03.2026 through email appellant has submitted as under:-

“This is to state that Appellant seeks exemption from Hearing dated 13/03/2026 for unavoidable circumstances.

Further, it is humbly Prayed to Yourself that UHBVN Authorities be directed to produce the Copy of Revised Demand Estimate for the Shifting of Tubewell Connection of Appellant.

As per the Attached RTI Information received from UHBVN, it is stated that the Plan for Shifting All Tubewell Connections from Non AP Feeder to AP Feeder IN OUR AREA has been Approved by the Competent Authority but the Revised Demand Estimate for Shifting Case of Appellant has not been finalized Yet.

Shall be highly obliged & indebted for Your kind Direction please.”

**J.** Hearing was held today i.e. on 13.03.2026 as scheduled. The hearing was attended by the XEN/Works from the office of the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak and the SDO, Model Town Sub Division, UHBVN, Karnal along with learned counsel for the respondents. The appellant did not appear in person. Instead, he chose to send an email seeking exemption from personal appearance, which has been taken on record and considered solely in the interest of justice.

It is categorically recorded that the appellant has adopted a consistent pattern of seeking exemption from personal appearance through emails for every successive hearing. This repeated conduct has materially delayed the proceedings and is viewed with serious disfavour. The appellant is hereby put on express notice that any



further request for exemption without cogent, verifiable and sufficient cause shall not be entertained, and the matter shall proceed ex-parte against him.

During the hearing, the respondents placed before this Forum the revised estimate prepared for shifting of the appellant's agricultural tubewell connection (Account No. 6488781000). It was submitted that the appellant has conveyed his concurrence to the said revised estimate. However, upon perusal of the entire record, including the original application, the CGRF order dated 30.10.2025, and the submissions made, it is observed that the core issue arises from the appellant's application for shifting filed in April 2025 on account of bore failure. The initial estimate was duly sanctioned, demand notice was issued, and the CGRF explicitly held that the benefits envisaged under the subsequent Sales Circular cannot be extended retrospectively to an application filed much prior to the issuance of the said circular.

The language employed by the appellant in his successive emails is found to be deliberately ambiguous and open to multiple interpretations. While on the one hand he seeks personal exemptions, on the other he continues to raise demands and expectations of relief. Such conduct does not assist in fair and expeditious adjudication.

In view of the above and to prevent any further protraction of the matter (which cannot be permitted to linger indefinitely, given the volume of other cases pending before this Forum and the conduct of the parties), the following directions are issued in exercise of the powers vested in this office:

- (a) The respondents shall file a specific, comprehensive and point-wise written reply strictly addressing the appellant's original application dated April 2025, the entire sequence of events thereafter, the rationale for the revised estimate, and the legal untenability of retrospective application of the subsequent Sales Circular. The reply shall also deal with every contention raised in the appeal and shall be supported by relevant documents and affidavits. The same shall be filed within 10 days from the date of this order, with an advance copy served upon the appellant.
- (b) The appellant is directed to appear in person on the next date of hearing to clarify his stand unequivocally on the revised estimate, his concurrence thereto, and his willingness to abide by the legal position settled by the CGRF regarding retrospectivity. Any further email communication in lieu of personal appearance shall not be accepted except in cases of genuine medical emergency supported by documentary proof.
- (c) Both parties shall comply with all pending directions issued vide the earlier interim orders dated 18.12.2025 and 07.01.2026, if not already complied with.

The matter is adjourned for arguments and final hearing on 17.04.2026

**K.** On 30.03.2026 through email appellant has submitted as under:-

As per Attachment, Interim Order was Pronounced in Appeal No.-46 of 2025 on 13.03.2026.

Quoting Relevant extract from the Attached Interim Order-

"The respondents shall file a specific, comprehensive and point-wise written reply strictly addressing the appellant's original application dated April 2025, the entire sequence of events thereafter, the rationale for the revised estimate, and the legal untenability of retrospective application of the subsequent Sales Circular. The reply shall also deal with every contention raised in the appeal and shall be supported by relevant documents and affidavits. The same shall be filed within 10 days from the date of this order, with an advance copy served upon the appellant."

As per above, the Respondent was to File Reply within 10 days from the Order dated 13.03.2026 with an Advance Copy served upon the Appellant/undersigned.

But No such Advance Copy is received by the Appellant/undersigned.

Kindly arrange to direct the Respondent to serve upon an advance copy to the Appellant.

Shall be highly obliged for the same."

**L.** Letter dated vide memo no. 8645 dated 03.04.2026, SDO respondent has submitted compliance of interim order dated 16.03.2026 (Appeal No. 46 of 2025, registered on 19.11.2025) which is as under:-

"In compliance with the aforementioned interim order, please find the chronological timeline and detailed facts regarding the actions taken by this office:

**Application Receipt:** The application for shifting the Tubewell connection was received via email on 16.04.2025 (Annexure-1).

**Initial Estimate:** An initial estimate was formulated and submitted to higher authorities via Memo No. 6662 on 28.04.2025 (Annexure-2).

**Consumer Consent:** On 01.05.2025, the consumer provided consent via email to deposit the estimate amount and ensure the Right of Way (Annexure-3).

**Revised Estimate:** Following observations from higher authorities, a revised Deposit Estimate was submitted via Memo No. 6688 on 05.05.2025 (Annexure-4).

**Sanction of Estimate:** Deposit Estimate No. 21314/CDD-112/2025-26, amounting to Rs. 3,75,143.00, was officially sanctioned on 15.05.2025 (Annexure-5).

**Demand Notices & Non-Compliance:** A Demand Notice (Memo No. 6813) was issued on 19.05.2025, followed by reminders on 03.10.2025 and 10.11.2025. To date, the consumer has neither deposited the amount nor opted for the self-execution scheme (1.5% payment) (Annexure-6, 7 & 8).

**Legal Untenability of Retrospective Application:** The appellant's primary contention involves seeking benefits from a Sales Circular issued subsequent to his application. As upheld by the CGRF in its order dated 30.10.2025 (Case No. 193 of 2025), the benefits of new Sales Circulars cannot be applied retrospectively to applications filed and processed under the prevailing rules at the time of submission

(April 2025). The Nigam maintains that the original terms of the sanctioned estimate remain legally binding as the application predates the policy change.

It is also submitted that currently the AP connection of the consumer is running on Shri Ram Colony urban feeder. During the sequence of events the higher authorities gave direction to shift the existing AP connections running on urban feeder to the nearest AP feeder.

Accordingly, the estimate was framed to shift the existing AP connections from urban to AP feeder and same was sanctioned by the competent authority. Due to wheat crop, the execution work of the above stated estimate is pending and will be completed after crop harvesting. As per the request of the appellant, the revised estimate for the tubewell shifting will be made available to him after completion of shifting work which already has been intimated to the appellant (Annexure-9).

Submitted for your kind information and consideration, please.”

**M.** The hearing in the above-captioned appeal was held today i.e. on 17.04.2026 as scheduled in compliance with the interim order dated 16.03.2026. The appellant, Shri Surjeet Sandhu, appeared in person for the first time in the entire proceedings. The respondents were represented by the XEN/Works from the office of the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak, the SDO, Ram Nagar / Model Town Sub Division, UHBVN, Karnal, and their learned counsel. The reply filed by the respondents in compliance with the directions contained in the interim order dated 13.03.2026 (and subsequent directions) was taken on record.

The appellant, during the course of hearing, stated that he would submit a fresh application for shifting of his tubewell connection (Account No. 6488781000) after receiving due notice from the office of the SDO, Ram Nagar Sub Division, UHBVN, Karnal. He further reiterated his prayer for grant of compensation of Rs. 3,00,000/- on account of alleged crop damage, as mentioned in the reply dated 15.04.2026. He contended that the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak had admitted that the work of shifting all tubewell connections running on the urban feeder (including the 12 connections on the Surat Singh Wala feeder) to the AP feeder ought to have been completed in the year 2024 itself, and that this was the sole reason for the delay in processing his request.

The respondents, in their detailed compliance reply dated 03.04.2026 and the statement of Sh. Dinesh Nain, AE/SDO (OP) Ram Nagar Sub Division dated 11.04.2026, have categorically clarified the sequence of events. The application for shifting was received only on 16.04.2025 (and not on 07.02.2025 as claimed by the appellant, for which no proof exists on record). After due processing, including obtaining consumer consent dated 01.05.2025 to bear the cost and provide ROW, the estimate was sanctioned on 15.05.2025 for Rs. 3,75,103/- (Deposit Estimate No. 21314/CDD-112/2025-26). Demand notice was issued on 19.05.2025, followed by reminders. The appellant neither deposited the amount nor opted for the self-execution scheme, despite having given an undertaking before the CGRF.

The core issue in the appeal is the appellant's claim for retrospective application of Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 dated 27.06.2025, which provides for free shifting of



AP connections up to 70 metres (with cost to be claimed by the Nigam through ARR). The shifting distance in the present case admittedly exceeds 70 metres, and the appellant's application was processed and the estimate sanctioned much prior to the issuance of the said circular. The CGRF, after hearing the appellant in person, had categorically recorded that he was convinced and ready to deposit the charges or opt for self-execution. The CGRF's order dated 30.10.2025 is based on the prevailing instructions at the relevant time (including Sales Circular No. U-33/2001 and subsequent instructions) and advice of the Commercial Wing. The said circular cannot be applied retrospectively, as held consistently by the CGRF and affirmed by this office in the earlier interim orders.

## **Decision**

After hearing both the parties and going through the record made available on file, upon perusal of the entire record, including the enquiry report dated 24.12.2025 submitted by the XEN (Operation) City Division, the chronological timeline furnished by the respondents, the statement of the SDO, and the proceedings before the CGRF, it is established beyond doubt that there was no deliberate or intentional delay on the part of the respondents. The delay in processing was primarily attributable to the appellant's own failure to furnish complete documents in time and his subsequent non-compliance with the demand notice. The appellant has repeatedly changed his stand: initially agreeing before the CGRF to deposit or self-execute, then seeking retrospective benefit of a later circular, then consenting to the feeder-shifting proposal of the Chief Engineer (Operation), and now demanding compensation while agreeing to file a fresh application.

This Forum records its strong disapproval of the appellant's conduct throughout the proceedings. He has persistently sought exemption from personal appearance in almost every hearing through emails containing ambiguous and open-to-interpretation language. He has simultaneously pursued multiple parallel channels -complaints, RTIs, CPGRAM, emails to higher authorities, and representations to various forums-apparently with a view to exerting undue pressure on the respondents to accede to his demands without complying with the Nigam's instructions or depositing the lawfully sanctioned charges. Such tactics not only burden the administrative machinery but also amount to forum-shopping and abuse of the grievance redressal process. The appellant cannot be permitted to benefit from his own defaults and inconsistent stands.

In view of the above, this Forum holds as under:

1. The appeal is dismissed with no costs. The order of the CGRF dated 30.10.2025 is upheld in its entirety.

2. The Deposit Estimate No. 21314/CDD-112/2025-26 dated 15.05.2025 for Rs. 3,75,103/- was validly sanctioned as per the Nigam instructions prevailing at the time of the appellant's application. The appellant is not entitled to any retrospective benefit under Sales Circular No. U-07/2025 dated 27.06.2025.
3. The appellant's prayer for grant of compensation of ₹3,00,000/- on account of alleged crop damage is rejected as being wholly untenable and unsustainable in law. It is an admitted position on record that the appellant neither deposited the sanctioned estimated amount nor opted for self-execution of the shifting work, despite his specific undertaking given before the CGRF. Any alleged loss or damage to the crops is, therefore, a direct consequence of the appellant's own inaction, laches and non-compliance with the Nigam's instructions and cannot be fastened upon the respondents.

Further, the grievance sought to be raised by the appellant in response to the communication/reply of the then Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak, does not furnish any valid or tenable ground for grant of compensation, inasmuch as the same is neither related to nor arises out of the appellant's original application for shifting of the tubewell connection or the subsequent sanction of the estimate. The appellant appears to be deliberately attempting to create an independent and extraneous ground for compensation which is neither pleaded in the appeal nor sustainable in law and is, therefore, not liable to be entertained or admitted by this Forum.

4. The respondents are directed to proceed with the shifting of the relevant tubewell connections (including the appellant's) from the urban feeder to the AP feeder after completion of crop harvesting, as per their own statement, and to endeavour to complete the work by 15.05.2026 subject to availability of Right of Way (ROW) and any other operational constraints.
5. Upon completion of the aforesaid feeder-shifting exercise, the respondents shall issue notice to the appellant calling upon him to submit a fresh application for shifting of his tubewell connection. A revised estimate, if any, shall be prepared and sanctioned within one week of receipt of the fresh application, strictly as per the then prevailing Nigam instructions. The appellant shall be at liberty to deposit the amount or opt for self-execution, as the case may be.
6. Following the conclusion of the final hearing on 17.04.2026, the matter was reserved for orders. It has been observed that the appellant has engaged in a pattern of lodging repetitive complaints before various authorities, the motivations for which remain unsubstantiated. Such conduct constitutes an abuse of the process of law before this quasi-judicial body, established

under the Electricity Act, 2003. This forum finds such behavior unbecoming of a responsible citizen, as the vexatious escalation of a dispute cannot supersede the settled material facts of the case.

Both parties are directed to comply with the above directions in letter and spirit. In the event of any difficulty, either party may seek clarification from this office by way of a proper application.

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 21<sup>st</sup> April, 2026.

Sd/-

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

**Dated:21.04.2026**

**CC:**

**Memo No. 216-32/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 46/2025**

**Dated: 22.04.2026**

To

1. Shri Surjeet Sandhu, House Number-18;Sector-7, Urban Estate Karnal, Haryana-132001 (E-mail- [surjeetsandhu181818@gmail.com](mailto:surjeetsandhu181818@gmail.com))
2. The Managing Director, Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, Vidyut Sadan, IP No.: 3&4, Sector-14, Panchkula (Email [md@uhbvn.org.in](mailto:md@uhbvn.org.in)).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Shakti Bhawan, Sector- 6, Panchkula (Email [lr@hvpn.org.in](mailto:lr@hvpn.org.in)).
4. The Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, 4th Floor Rajiv Gandhi Vidyut Bhawan near Medical Mor Delhi Road, Rohtak (Email [ceoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in](mailto:ceoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in)).
5. The SE (Operations), Rohtak, 3rd Floor Rajiv Gandhi Vidyut Bhawan near Medical Mor Delhi Road, Rohtak (Email [seoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in](mailto:seoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in))
6. XEN/OP City, Division, UHBVN Karnal, Power House colony, Karnal (Email [xenopcikarnal@uhbvn.org.in](mailto:xenopcikarnal@uhbvn.org.in))
7. SDO/OP, Ram Nagar Sub Division, UHBVN, Karnal, H.No. 388, Near Hanuman Mandir, Krishna N (Email [sdoooprarnagar@uhbvn.org.in](mailto:sdoooprarnagar@uhbvn.org.in))