



(Regd. Post)

Appeal No. : 50 of 2025
Registered on : 24.12.2025
Date of Order : 05.03.2026

In the matter of:

Appeal against the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 278 of 2025

Shri Rambhaj, S/o Shri Mange Ram R/o Village – Sanghi, District – Rohtak **Appellant**

Versus

1. The XEN/OP Sub Urban Division No. 2, UHBVN Rohtak
2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Jassia **Respondent**

Before:

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:

Dr. Vandana representative of appellant

Present on behalf of Respondents:

Shri Pardeep Kumar, SDO/ OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Jassia

ORDER

A. Shri Rambhaj has filed an appeal against the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by CGRF, UHBVNL, Panchkula in case no. 278 of 2025. The appellant has submitted as under: -

I, Sh. Rambhaj S/o Sh. Mange Ram, resident of Village Sanghi, District Rohtak, respectfully submit this appeal against the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by the CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in Complaint No. Ch-09/UH/CGRF-278/2025, whereby my grievance has been disposed of on the ground that a similar case was allegedly decided earlier on 28.08.2025.

I had approached the CGRF seeking redressal of my grievance regarding shifting of the electricity line / putting the insulated cable, as the existing line is causing continuous difficulty and safety concerns to me as well as to the public.

The CGRF disposed of my complaint stating that a similar case was already decided on 28.08.2025. However, I respectfully submit that no copy of any such order dated 28.08.2025 has ever been provided to me till date. Further, no notice of hearing was issued to me nor was I informed about the proceedings, reasons or outcome of the alleged earlier decision.

Even as on date, the problem of the electricity line still exists and my grievance has not been resolved in any manner.

In view of the facts stated above, I humbly request Hon'ble Ombudsman to:

- Set aside / quash the CGRF order dated 21.11.2025 passed in Complaint No. Ch-09/UH/CGRF-278/2025;

- Direct the department to either shift the electricity line or, at the very least, replace it with a properly insulated/covered cable, as the unsafe line not only poses a continuous threat to public safety but has also subjected me to repeated humiliation, mental harassment and distress due to persistent inaction despite repeated complaints.
 - Pass any other order(s) deemed fit and proper in the interest of justice.
- B.** The appeal was registered on 24.12.2025 as an appeal No. 50 of 2025 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 14.01.2026.
- C.** The respondent SDO vide email dated 12.01.2026 has submitted reply, which is as under:
- In the above subject cited context, it is submitted that complainant wants to shift 11kv Rajpura AP line and not ready to bear the cost of deposit estimate. Undersigned has visited site and found 4no. Mango trees grown on the edge of fields and an 11kv AP line is crossing through the trees, currently insulation pipes have been installed on the 11kv conductor so that there would be no electrocution and there is no need to cut the branches of the trees. If consumer want to get shift this line or get it replace with 11kv XLPE cable then he has to bear the cost of deposit estimate as per sale nigram circular. Nigram has already framed the deposit estimate of Rs. 79145/- to shift 11kv line and Rs. 99800 to replace the existing line on 25mm 3 core XLPE cable on consumer request.*
- It is also submitted that the matter enquired from site and office staff at the time of release of connection, complainant Sh. Ram Bhaj S/o Sh. Mange Ram did not opposed and connection was released as per his consent.*
- Further as per sales circular No. U-11/2023 of UHBVN. Nigram can shift the lines, free of cost for Govt. Schools, Govt. Colleges, Govt. Hospitals & Govt. Veterinary institutions. Private schools only if recognised by education board.*
- Hence the line of the complainant can be shifted on the cost of beneficiary.*
- Further it is submitted that the complainant also filed a complaint in CGRF vide complaint No. 260 dated 28.08.2024, and complaint no 260/2024 on dated 28.08.2024 the same was disposed off (copy attached).*
- This is for your kind attention and further n/a please.*
- D.** Hearing was held on 14.01.2026, as scheduled. Both the parties were present physically. The representative of the Appellant, Dr. Vandana Mudgil, highlighted the ongoing concerns regarding the 11 kV Rajpura AP line passing through the Appellant's mango trees. It was submitted that the Appellant had independently

installed insulation pipes as a temporary measure to safeguard the trees and prevent electrocution hazards. However, these pipes are prone to displacement during strong winds or storms, instilling a constant fear of potential loss of life and property. Furthermore, the Appellant expressed distress over the Respondents' trimming practices, which involve cutting main branches, thereby causing significant damage to the trees that the Appellant has nurtured for decades. This has resulted in substantial mental agony to the Appellant's aged father and has rendered the affected trees inaccessible for routine care.

The representative of the Respondents, Shri Manish (SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Jassia), clarified that the trimming of branches is a standard preventive maintenance activity undertaken to avert breakdowns in the electrical line and ensure uninterrupted power supply to consumers. He reiterated that two viable options are available to resolve the issue: (i) replacement of the existing line with 25 mm² three-core XLPE cable at an estimated cost of Rs. 99,800/-, or (ii) shifting of the 11 kV line at an estimated cost of Rs. 79,145/-. It was further noted that the matter had previously been addressed in CGRF Complaint No. 260/2024 dated 28.08.2024, which was disposed of by the Forum. The Respondents emphasized that any shifting or replacement must be executed in accordance with the relevant sales circulars and instructions of the Nigam, with the costs borne by the beneficiary, except in specified cases for government institutions.

The concerns raised by the Appellant were noted with due consideration. The Electricity Ombudsman explained to the Appellant's representative the operational framework governing the Respondents' actions, which are guided by the applicable sales circulars and instructions, including Sales Circular No. U-11/2023 of UHBVN. Following detailed discussions and counseling by the Electricity Ombudsman, the Appellant's representative, after consulting with the Appellant, submitted an undertaking expressing consent to proceed with the shifting of the line under the self-execution scheme.

In view of the above, the Respondents are hereby directed to:

1. Promptly assess the feasibility of executing the line shifting work under the self-execution scheme, ensuring it aligns with the governing sales circulars, instructions, and technical standards of the Nigam.
2. Collaborate with the Appellant to finalize a practical solution that addresses the Appellant's grievances to their satisfaction, while minimizing any further damage to the trees and ensuring safety compliance.
3. Complete the necessary preparatory steps, including any required approvals or estimates, and initiate the work under the self-execution scheme without undue delay.
4. Submit a compliance report detailing the actions taken, the agreed solution, and the status of resolution to this office at least 10 days prior to the next date of hearing.

The objective of these directions is to facilitate an amicable and expeditious resolution of this long-pending complaint within the ambit of the applicable

regulations, given the Appellant's consent to the self-execution scheme post-counseling.

The matter is adjourned for further hearing and is now listed for 05.03.2026.

- E.** On 15.01.2026, appellant has submitted an application in which he has mentioned that that his daughter attended the hearing on behalf of him i.e. Sh. Rambhaj S/o Shri Mange Ram his daughter was unaware of the fact about the self-execution scheme and was also unaware of the technical and the financial conditions of the scheme, so whatever letter has been got written or got signed were without proper knowledge and understanding. My request pertains to waving of the amount of estimate with Rs. 79145/-.

Thus, it is humbly requested that due to my ill health and unawareness of my daughter the matter may be reconsider and another opportunity of hearing may be provided to me.

- F.** On 03.03.2026, SDO respondent has submitted compliance of interim order dated 14.01.2026 which is as under:-

In above subject cited context, it is submitted that complainant want to shift 11 KV AP line and not ready to bear the cost of deposit estimate. Undersigned has visited site and found 4 No. Mango trees grown on the edge of fields and 11 KV AP line crossing through the trees, currently insulation pipes have been installed on the 11 KV conductor so that there would be no electrocution and there is no need to cut branches of the trees. If consumer want to get shift this line or get it replace with 11 KV XLPE cable, then he must bear the cost of deposit estimate as per sale nigram circular.

On dated 14.01.2026, Hon'ble The Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana passed an interim order to visit the site for assessing the feasibility of executing the line shifting work under self-execution scheme, as complainant give his consent to carry out under self-execution scheme.

In this regard, this office framed an estimate to replace the existing ACSR with XLPE cable which was already sanctioned vide estimate No. SUD-259/2025-26 of amount Rs. 99829/.

Further complainant informed vide this office memo No. 218 dated 02-03-2026 to deposit the supervision charges (1.5% of estimate amount + GST and the cost of cable & pole in this office as per availability of materials But complainant refused to deposit the above said amount on telephonic discussion.

This is for your kind information and further information.

- G.** The matter was heard on 05.03.2026, as scheduled. Both parties appeared physically and made detailed submissions. The pleadings, documents on record (including the CGRF order, Nigam replies, estimates, previous proceedings, and representations), arguments advanced, and the applicable statutory framework have been carefully examined.

Decision

1. The present appeal arises out of the order dated 27.11.2025 passed by the CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in Complaint No. 278 of 2025, whereby the grievance of the Appellant for shifting/replacement of an existing 11 kV line free of cost was dismissed. Aggrieved thereby, the Appellant preferred this appeal on 24.12.2025, which was registered as Appeal No. 50 of 2025.
2. Brief Facts of the Case

The Appellant is the owner of ancestral agricultural land in Village Sanghi, District Rohtak. Four to five mango trees (approximately 45-50 years old) stand near the edge of the field. An 11 kV Rajpura AP line, erected in the year 2009 for release of a tubewell connection to another consumer (Sh. Surajmal), passes through these trees.

The Appellant has been seeking shifting of the line or its replacement with 25 mm² 3-core XLPE cable free of cost, contending that the routing was erroneous, repeated trimming damages the trees, fruit yield has reduced, and the line poses safety hazards. To mitigate risk, the Appellant himself installed PVC insulation pipes on the conductor at his own cost (~ ₹5,000). These pipes, however, get displaced during strong winds/storms.

Earlier, the Appellant had filed Complaint No. 260/2024 before the CGRF, which was disposed of on 28.08.2025. The present complaint (No. 278/2025) was dismissed by the CGRF on the ground that the issue stood already adjudicated.

3. Proceedings before this Office Notice was issued and the matter was heard on 14.01.2026. After detailed counseling on the governing regulations and sales circulars, the Appellant's representative submitted a written undertaking consenting to shifting under the self-execution scheme. The matter was adjourned to 05.03.2026 with directions to the Respondents to assess feasibility.

The Appellant, however, later submitted a representation dated 15.01.2026 retracting the undertaking on the plea that his representative was not fully conversant with the financial and technical implications and praying for free shifting on sympathetic/humanitarian grounds.

The matter was finally heard on 05.03.2026. The Respondent-SDO submitted his detailed reply dated 05.03.2026 (in continuation of reply dated 03.03.2026). The

Appellant's representative reiterated financial hardship and that the line placement was not the Appellant's fault.

4. Submissions of the Parties

Appellant:

- The trees have been nurtured for decades; repeated trimming by the Nigam damages main branches and affects yield.
- Insulation pipes are temporary and unreliable during storms.
- The line was allegedly drawn out of malice in 2009.
- The Appellant is not in a financial position to pay the estimated amount (₹99,829/- for XLPE replacement or ₹79,145/- for shifting).
- The placement of the line is not the Appellant's fault; hence, the Nigam should bear the cost or shift the line free of cost on sympathetic grounds.

Respondents:

- The 11kV line is existing licensee infrastructure erected in 2009. Shifting/replacement on the request of a private consumer is governed by HERC (Duty to Supply Electricity on Request...) Regulations, 2016 and Sales Circular No. U-11/2023 (still in force).
 - The entire cost must be borne by the beneficiary. Free shifting is permitted only for specified Government institutions.
 - Deposit estimates have already been sanctioned (Estimate No. SUD-259/2025-26 for ₹99,829/- for XLPE replacement; another for shifting ₹79,145/-).
 - The Appellant was informed vide Memo No. 218 dated 02.03.2026 to deposit supervision charges (1.5% + GST) and cost of cable & pole, but he refused on telephonic discussion.
 - The demand for free shifting amounts to seeking undue benefit in gross violation of Sales Circulars No. U-11/2023, 19/2023, 30/2023 and 1/2025. There is no provision under the Nigam's instructions to grant such relief on humanitarian grounds.
 - Trimming is essential preventive maintenance. No objection was raised by the Appellant at the time of erection in 2009. The issue was already adjudicated by the CGRF earlier.
5. Analysis and Findings The sole issue before this office is whether the Appellant is entitled to shifting or replacement of the existing 11 kV line free of cost (or waiver of the sanctioned deposit estimate) on the ground of protection of his private mango trees.

The answer is in the negative for the following reasons:

- (i) Statutory Mandate Regulation 4.1 read with Regulation 4.6 of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Duty to Supply Electricity on Request and Power to Recover Expenditure...) Regulations, 2016 (as amended) expressly entitles the licensee to recover the entire reasonable expenditure for any modification, extension or shifting of electric lines. Shifting is treated as a “modification” and the beneficiary must bear the full estimated cost. Even under the self-execution scheme (Regulation 3.10), the applicant is required to pay supervision charges (1.5%) and any shortfall.
- (ii) UHBVN Sales Circular No. U-11/2023 (operative circular, reaffirmed in Compendium of Instructions up to 31.03.2025) Shifting of 11 kV/LT lines on the request of a private consumer (including farmers for protection of trees/crops) is permissible only after deposit of the full estimated cost. Free shifting is allowed exclusively for Government Schools, Colleges, Hospitals, Veterinary Institutions and recognized private schools. No exception exists for private individuals on grounds of tree protection, financial hardship or sympathy.
- (iii) SOP – Sales Circular/Instruction U-01/2025 dated 11.02.2025 The procedure is clear: application → site verification → sanction of deposit estimate → payment by consumer → execution. There is no provision for waiver.
- (iv) Additional Facts
- The line was erected in 2009; the Appellant (or his predecessor) raised no objection at that time.
 - Growth of trees over 16+ years does not create a right to demand free shifting.
 - The Appellant’s own installation of insulation pipes is a temporary safety measure that does not impose any obligation on the Nigam to provide a permanent solution free of cost.
 - Financial hardship or the plea that “it is not our fault” cannot override statutory cost-recovery provisions or burden other consumers through tariff.
 - The demand for free shifting is in gross violation of the cited sales circulars and amounts to seeking undue benefit.

The undertaking given on 14.01.2026 (even if later retracted) was furnished after full counseling. Retraction does not alter the legal position. The earlier CGRF adjudication further bars re-agitation of the same grievance.

6. Conclusion and Order After hearing both parties, perusing the entire record, the replies dated 03.03.2026 and 05.03.2026 of the Respondent-SDO, and considering the applicable statutory provisions and Nigam instructions, this office holds that the request for free shifting or waiver of the deposit estimate is not maintainable.

The order of the CGRF dated 27.11.2025 does not suffer from any illegality, arbitrariness or jurisdictional error and is hereby upheld.

The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Directions:

1. The Appellant, if so desires, may submit a fresh application for shifting under the self-execution scheme or through the Nigam by depositing the sanctioned/revised estimate amount (₹99,829/- for XLPE replacement or ₹79,145/- for shifting, as the case may be) along with the requisite undertaking for Right of Way. The Respondents shall process the same expeditiously in accordance with Sales Circular U-11/2023 and SOP U-01/2025.
2. The Respondents shall continue to undertake necessary maintenance activities (including trimming of branches and periodic checks of insulation) so as to ensure safety of human life, livestock and property while minimizing avoidable damage to the trees, as far as technically feasible.

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 05.03.2026.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)

Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana

Dated: 05.03.2026

CC:

Memo No.2940/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 50/2025

Dated:06.03.2026

1. Shri Rambhaji, S/o Shri Mange Ram R/o Village – Sanghi, District – Rohtak (email vandanamudgil9@gmail.com, rambhajsharma44@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).
3. Legal Remembrancer, Haryana Power Utilities, Shakti Bhawan, Sector- 6, Panchkula (Email lr@hvpn.org.in).
4. The Chief Engineer (Operation), Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited, 4th Floor Rajiv Gandhi Vidyut Bhawan near Medical Mor Delhi Road, Rohtak (Email 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)
6. XEN/OP Sub Urban Division No. 2, UHBVN Rohtak, 1st Floor 33 KV S/Stn. Sampla near Bus Stand Sampla (Email xenopsu2rohtak@uhbvn.org.in)
7. SDO/OP Sub Division, UHBVN, Jassia, 132 KV Power House Jassia (Email sdoopjassia@uhbvn.org.in)