



(Regd. Post)

Appeal No. : 16 of 2025
Registered on : 27.04.2026
Date of Order : 31.08.2026

In the matter of:

Appeal against the order dated 27.02.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 138 of 2025

Shri Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan resident of village Garhi Bhallor, **Appellant**
District Panipat

Versus

1. The XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha
2. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Beholi **Respondent**

Before:

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:

Shri Randhir Singh

Present on behalf of Respondents:

Shri Anil, SDO/OP, Beholi
Shri Parveen Kumar

ORDER

A. Shri Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan resident of village Garhi Bhallor, District Panipat has filed an appeal against the order dated 27.02.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in case no. 138 of 2026. The appellant has submitted as under: -

I Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan resident of village Garhi Bhallor, District Panipat is a consumer of UHBVN through AP Tubewell connection bearing account No. AP 10-1024-X under (OP) S/Divn UHBVN Biholi (Division Samalkha, Circle Panipat) humbly submitted and prayed as under: -

That earlier an appeal was filed before you against the order dated 30/08/2024 passed by Hon'ble CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in complaint No. 105/2024 which was registered on 09/01/2025 bearing No. 01/2025 and upon hearing the case was remand back to the Hon'ble CGRF, Panchkula vide order dated 07/03/2025 to relook and deciding the prayer of both the parties on merits by applying relevant instructions of the Nigam/HERC Regulations as also mentioned at page no. 11 in first para of the decision in order dated 27/02/2026 passed in complaint No. UH/CGRH-138/2025(Copy of order attached at Annexure-A).

The facts of the complaint/case are that the AP Tubewell connection Sh. bearing account No. AP 10-1024-X was earlier in the name of my Grandfather Jage Ram and the electricity bills were being issued at his name till 28/01/2021. Later on after the death of my Grandfather, my father and uncle Sh. Sukhbir Singh S/o Sh. Jage Ram being legal heirs of Sh. Jage Ram and his property the said tubewell

connection was transferred in my name and affidavits were also submitted by them in this regard in my favour. Thereafter the bills were issued by the UHBVN in my name and the payment of the bills have also been made by me continued till 4/10/2024 (Copy of bills attached at Annexure-B). In case of death of real owner of agricultural tubewell connection, the tubewell connection can be transferred to the legal heir of the Tubewell Connection Holder. There is no hinderance in transferring the same as per rule of UHBVN.

The Tubewell connection can also be transferred if the land is sold, the connection can be transferred to the new owner. But in this case/complaint the seller is only owner of the agricultural land, he is not the owner of the tubewell connection, hence he is not entitled to sell the tubewell connection to the purchaser.

The owner of the Tubewell Connection Sh. Jage Ram has already been died and his legal heirs Sh. Kanwar Bhan (my father) and Sh. Sukhbir Singh (my uncle) have already transferred the Tubewell Connection bearing No. AP10-1024-X in favour of me i.e. Randhir Singh by submitting their affidavit in the office of concerned Electricity Department Office. As the First right of the said Tubewell Connection exists with sole legal heirs and they further transfer it to me being their legal heir, hence, there remains no question to further transfer the Tubewell connection in the name of Smt. Nirmla Devi.

Sh. Parveen Kumar S/o Sh. Vijay Pal got the said connection changed in the name of Smt. Nirmla Devi with fraud and while changing the tubewell connection in her name no NOC obtained from all co-sharers and no notice was given to me by the Electricity Department.

Here I would like to draw your kind attention towards line no. 6 of decision para at page no.10 of Hon'ble CGRF order dated 30.8.2024 passed in complaint No. UH/CGRF-105/2024 (copy attached at Annexure-C) as under: -

"Moreover, as per Halka Kanungo Report submitted on 03.06.2023 and further certified on 18.07.2024 also speaks volume that in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1, the tubewell premises/electricity connection is existing in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1, West-mid side and 39/27 East-mid side, the tubewell bore is situated. So the pleading/contention made by the complainant has been found genuine."

It is pertinent to mention here that remaining part of the tubewell i.e. Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) is still exists in Khasra No. 39/27 (Photo attached at Annexure-D) and appellant/complaint i.e. Randhir Singh is owner of Khasra No. 39/27 and that material fact has been concealed by Sh. Parveen Kumar in the abovesaid complaint No. UH/CGRF-105/2024 and that fact

is also not been mentioned in the final order dated 30.08.2024 passed by Hon'ble CGRF.

As far as, the question of existence of tubewell borewell is concerned the Tubewell Borewell exists on the Maind/Bund of Khasra No. 39/8/1/1/ and Khasra No. 39/27 i.e. on the land of Smt. Nirmla Devi and on the land of Appellant/Complainant Sh. Randhir Singh jointly. Tubewell borewell is not clearly exist on the land of Smt. Nirmla Devi alone.

As the Tubewell Borewell exists on the Maind/Bund of Khasra No. 39/8/1/1/ and Khasra No. 39/27 i.e. on the land of Smt. Nirmla Devi and on the land of Appellant/Complainant Sh. Randhir Singh jointly. The tubewell premises/electricity connection is existing in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1 as mentioned in Hon'ble CGRF order dated 30.08.2024. The remaining part of the tubewell i.e. Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) is still exists in Khasra No. 39/27 in the land of me i.e. Randhir Singh also. I/appellant have more weightage than opposite/other party being legal heir of the Tubewell Connection Holder as per instructions/guidelines of the UHBVN.

In the order dated 27.02.2026 passed by Hon'ble CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in complaint No. UH/CGRF-138/2025 at page No.1 in second para of the Decision it has been mentioned that "The Forum has gone through the case minutely and after observation of the relevant record/instructions/guidelines of the Nigam and has come to the conclusive decision that the order passed by this Forum on 30.08.2024 in Case/Complaint No.105/2024 beholds "good/fully justified and accurate (Copy of the order attached at Annexure-A)."

Here I would like to draw your kind attention that there is nowhere mentioned in the findings of the abovesaid order that which instructions/guidelines of the Nigam have been applied by the Hon'ble CGRF and which record/facts have been considered to reject my appeal/complaint. Neither any instructions/guidelines of the Nigam are there in the final decision which may prove that on these basis Complainant/Randhir Singh is not entitle for above Tubewell Connection and nor any detail of record/facts have been given which may prove that Smt. Nirmla Devi is only entitle for said tubewell connection.

Whereas, the case was remand back to the Hon'ble CGRF, Panchkula vide order dated 07/03/2025 to relook and deciding the prayer of both the parties on merits by applying relevant instructions of the Nigam/HERC Regulations.

It is, therefore, prayed that kindly consider my appeal and a fair order based on the true facts may kindly be issued in favour of the appellant Randhir Singh as the owner/original applicant of the Tubewell Connection Sh. Jage Ram has already been

died and his legal heirs Sh. Kanwar Bhan (my father) and Sh. Sukhbir Singh (my uncle) have already transferred the Tubewell Connection bearing No. AP10-1024-X in favour of me i.e. Randhir Singh by submitting their affidavit in the office of concerned Electricity Department Office. As the First right of the said Tubewell Connection exists with sole legal heirs and they further transfer it to me being their legal heir, hence, there remains no question to further transfer the Tubewell connection in the name of Smt. Nirmla Devi. I shall be highly obliged and this shall ensure natural law of justice.

- B.** The appeal was registered on 27.04.2026 as an appeal No. 16 of 2026 and accordingly, notice of motion to the Appellant and the Respondents was issued for hearing the matter on 02.06.2026.
- C.** On 02.06.2026, Shri Praveen Kumar has requested to implead me as a party. The request of Shri Praveen Kumar has been considered.
- D.** The hearing in this matter was held on 02.06.2026 as scheduled. Sh. Randhir Singh, the Appellant, appeared in person. Sh. Parveen Kumar has moved an application dated 02.06.2026 for impleadment. After hearing the parties and perusing the record, the following facts have emerged:
1. The tubewell connection in question bearing Account No. AP10-1024-X was originally released in the name of late Sh. Jage Ram. Sh. Jage Ram is survived by two legal heirs namely Sh. Kanwar Bhan and Sh. Sukhbir Singh. Sh. Kanwar Bhan has three sons — Sh. Rajender, Sh. Randhir (Appellant), and Sh. Balwan, while Sh. Sukhbir has two sons — Sh. Netar Pal and Sh. Satpal.
 2. It has come on record that Sh. Randhir Singh had submitted an online application bearing No. P-22-521-63 for change of name of the aforesaid tubewell connection from late Sh. Jage Ram to his own name. The said name change was effected by the SDO (OP) Sub-Division, Beholli. However, prima facie, the said transfer appears to have been carried out in violation of the Nigam's Sales Circular bearing Memo No. 3787/CS/UH/BOD (156.30) dated 05.06.2013 (particularly Point No. 1.1.5), without obtaining requisite NOCs from all legal heirs / co-sharers and without proper verification of documents.
 3. It is further observed from the reply submitted by the SDO (OP) Sub-Division, Beholli vide letter No. 421 dated 01.06.2026 and the earlier order of the Corporate CGRF dated 30.08.2024 passed in Complaint No. 105/2024 that the name transfer in favour of Smt. Nirmla Devi was effected without due compliance of Nigam instructions and without collecting NOCs from all concerned stakeholders. This requires thorough scrutiny.
 4. Sh. Parveen Kumar S/o Sh. Vijay Pal has been impleaded as in the present appeal in the interest of justice, as he claims interest in the matter through Smt. Nirmla Devi. He shall be treated as a necessary party in all future proceedings and shall be duly served with notices and copies of orders.

In view of the above and having regard to the fact that the dispute has substantial revenue law dimensions involving ownership and partition of land (Khasra No. 39/27 and 39/8/1/1), the following interim directions are issued in the interest of justice:

- a. Status Quo The electricity supply through tubewell connection AP10-1024-X shall continue. No coercive action for disconnection or recovery of dues shall be taken against till further orders. The regularly deposit the current bills shall be ensured.
- b. Investigation into Procedural Lapses - The XEN (OP) Division, UHBVN, Samalkha shall conduct a detailed investigation into the circumstances under which the name of the tubewell connection was changed, both in favour of Sh. Randhir Singh and subsequently in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi. The investigation shall specifically examine compliance with the aforesaid Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013 and other relevant Nigam instructions. The XEN shall submit a detailed investigation report highlighting the lapses, if any, on the part of the concerned officers/officials, along with recommended action, within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order.
- c. Joint Physical Inspection & Revenue Coordination- The XEN (OP) Division, Samalkha, in coordination with the Tehsildar / Halka Kanungo, Tehsil Bapoli, shall conduct a fresh joint physical inspection of the site within 20 days. The inspection shall include videography, demarcation of the tubewell bore, motor room, discharge pipeline, water tank, and all allied infrastructure, and its exact location vis-à-vis the khasra numbers. A report shall be submitted to this office with copies to all parties within 7 days thereafter.
- d. Undertaking for Land Partition - All parties i.e., the Appellant (Sh. Randhir Singh), (Sh. Parveen Kumar), and other co-sharers/legal heirs shall file separate written undertakings (duly affirmed before a Notary Public or Executive Magistrate) within 30 days, undertaking to:
 - Initiate and diligently pursue proceedings for partition (Khata Takseem) and mutation of the land in question before the competent Revenue Authorities at the earliest; and
 - Abide by the final determination of revenue records regarding the exact location and ownership of the tubewell after such partition. The final position of the tubewell as reflected in the revenue records post-partition shall be treated as a decisive factor for determining ownership of the electricity connection, subject to the final decision of this Authority and Nigam norms.

e. Filings by Parties

- All parties (Appellant, Sh. Parveen Kumar and Department) shall file their respective affidavits along with relevant documents (including registry deeds, earlier affidavits/NOCs, Jamabandi, mutation records, etc.) within **30 days**.
- The Department shall file its para-wise reply to the Appeal enclosing all relied-upon Sales Circulars/Instructions.

The next date of hearing is fixed for 22.07.2026 at 11:00 AM in the office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana, Ground Floor, Bays No. 33-36, Sector-4, Panchkula-134109. All parties, including the newly impleaded Sh. Parveen Kumar is directed to come prepared with complete compliance of the above directions so that the matter can be adjudicated finally on merits.

This order is passed without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties and shall not be treated as an expression on the merits of the case.

In the event of non-appearance, proceedings may be taken ex-parte.

- E.** On 21.07.2026, XEN/OP Samalkha has requested for extension of one week for submission of the detailed investigation report. The request has been considered by the competent authority. Accordingly, the matter was scheduled for hearing on 04.08.2026.

- F.** On 03.08.2026, Sh. Praveen Kumar has requested as under:-

विनम निवेदन यह है कि आपके कार्यालय के Memo No.-845 to 852/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 16/2026 dated 02.06.2026 की अनुपालना में आपको सानुरोध अवगत करवाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरी तबीयत कई दिन से खराब होने के कारण मैं दिनांक-04.08.2026 को होने वाली सुनवाई में उपस्थित नहीं हो सकता हूँ। अतः आपसे अनुरोध है कि उक्त मामले में मेरा पक्ष सुनने के पश्चात ही अंतिम निर्णय देने की कृपा करें व मुझे अभी तक आपके आदेशानुसार Xen/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha की जाँच रिपोर्ट की प्रति भी उपलब्ध नहीं करवाई गई है, उक्त जाँच रिपोर्ट की प्रति भी उपलब्ध करवाई जाये, ताकि मैं अपना पक्ष तथ्यों सहित आपके सम्मुख रख सकूँ। इसके लिए मैं आजीवन आपका आभारी रहूँगा।

- G.** On 04.08.2026, respondent has submitted investigation report which is as under:-
The detail investigation has been carried out by the undersigned as per record produced by SDO OP S/Divn UHBVN Beholi. The tubewell connection having a/c no. T2-62 was running in the name of Sh. Jage Ram S/o Sh. Gorbha Ram (AP-10-1024) in village Garhi Bhallor. Sh.Jage Ram was expired on 09.09.1989 & Sh. Sukhbir Singh s/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan are his sons.

Sh. Randhir Singh s/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan applied for change of name vide A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021. He submitted the NOC on affidavit from Sh. Kanwar Bhan & Sh. Sukhbir Singh S/o Sh. Jage Ram. During investigation it is revealed that Sh. Kanwar Bhan was not the owner of land as well as tubewell connection because he had transferred the land in the name of his son namely as Sh. Rajender & Sh. Randhir. Accordingly it was the necessity to get NOC from Sh. Rajender also. This was the lapse made by the then consumer clerk Sh. Sukhbir Singh LDC (now expired) and found responsible towards his duty.

Further it is intimated that Sh. Sandeep Kumar S/o Sh. Randhir Singh had applied for C.O.N of a/c no. AP-10-1024 vide A&A No. 9-22-2023-84 which was cancelled by the CC due to not providing the required documents to process of process the change of name (CON).

During investigation it is also noticed that Sh. Rajender S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan s/o Sh. Jage Ram sold his property to Smt. Nirmala Devi w/o Sh. Vijay Pal during the year 2011, with the written statement in his registry that the tubewell connection having a/c no. T2-62 along with kotha was also handed over to Smt. Nirmala Devi. She never made change of name (CON) of the said tubewell.

Thereafter Sh. Parveen s/o Smt. Nirmala Devi w/o Sh. Vijay Pal filed a complaint in the CGRF vide complaint no. UH/CGRF/105/2024. Which was decided on dated 30.08.2024 with the direction that "the Forum has observed that since cogent proof of registry has been given in which it has specifically been mentioned that the land alongwith the tubewell connection (bearing A/c no. T2-62) and now new A/c no. AP-10-1024X was also sold in the name of Smt. Nirmala Devi W/o Sh. Vijay Pal by seller Sh. Rajender Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan S/o Sh. Jage Ram. Moreover, as per Halka Kanungo Report submitted on 03.06.2023 and further certified on 18.07.2024 also speaks volume that in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1, the tubewell premises/electricity connection is existing in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1, West-mid side and 39/27 East-mid side, the tubewell bore is situated. So the pleading/contention made by the complainant has been found genuine. So the Forum directs SDO/Respondent to initiate further action regarding change of tubewell connection In favour of the complainant as per standing norms of the Nigam."

Accordingly the then Consumer Clerk Rahul LM of (OP) S/Divn UHBVN Beholi processed the case for change of name (CON) without adopting the procedure of change of name (CON) and he made attribute correction in the name of Smt. Nirmala Devi.

Due to this lapses Sh. Rahul LM the then Consumer Clerk found responsible for non depositing the processing charges as well as ACD and other Charges without obtaining the other required necessary documents as a proof of ownership.

Conclusion:-

1. Lapses found during the change of name (CON) from Sh. Jage Ram to Sh. Randhir Singh that NOC had not been taken from the land share holders of Sh. Rajender Singh S/o Sh. Randhir Singh.
2. Lapses found during the change of name (CON) from Sh. Randhir Singh to Smt. Nirmala Devi the change of name was done through the attribute correction in RAPDRP/ Billing system without taking any required documents and without getting deposited the Nigam's charges.

H. The matter was taken up for hearing on 04.08.2026 as scheduled. The Appellant, Shri Randhir Singh, appeared in person. Shri Anil Sheokand, SDO/OP Sub-Division, Beholi, appeared on behalf of the Respondents and placed on record a copy of the investigation report prepared by the XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, pursuant to the directions contained in the earlier Interim Order dated 02.06.2026.

Shri Parveen Kumar (impleaded party) had, vide email dated 03.08.2026, intimated that he was unable to appear on account of ill-health and had requested that no final decision be rendered without affording him an opportunity of being heard. He had further sought a copy of the investigation report of the XEN/OP Division, Samalkha.

The matter was discussed telephonically with Shri Parveen Kumar. After hearing the parties present and taking note of the communication received from the impleaded party, the following directions are issued in the interest of justice and with a view to ensuring a fair and complete adjudication:

1. The Respondents are directed to forthwith supply a complete copy of the investigation report of the XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, to the Appellant as well as to Shri Parveen Kumar (the impleaded party).
2. All parties, including the Appellant, the Respondents and the impleaded party Shri Parveen Kumar, are directed to remain present on the date of hearing, duly prepared with all supporting documents, claims and counter-claims.
3. It is made clear that sufficient opportunity has already been afforded to the parties. No further adjournment shall ordinarily be granted, and the matter shall be taken up for final hearing on merits on the date fixed.

This order is passed without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties and shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

The next date of hearing is fixed for 06.08.2026.

- I. The matter was taken up for hearing on 06.08.2026 as scheduled. The Appellant, Shri Randhir Singh, the impleaded party Shri Parveen Kumar, and the Respondent SDO appeared and were heard.

During the course of hearing, the parties placed on record various documents relating primarily to the sale and purchase of the land parcel (Khasra Nos. 39/27 and 39/8/1/1) and the consequential claim over the tubewell connection bearing Account No. AP10-1024-X (earlier T2-62). Shri Parveen Kumar submitted that the Corporate CGRF, UHBVN, had already examined the matter in Complaint No. UH/CGRF/105/2024 and, by its order dated 30.08.2024, had directed initiation of further action for change of name of the connection in favour of the then complainant in accordance with the standing norms of the Nigam. The Appellant, on the other hand, relied upon an affidavit recorded by Shri Rajender Singh and other supporting documents.

The investigation report submitted by the XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha (pursuant to the directions contained in the Interim Order dated 02.06.2026) was also placed on record. The said report records, inter alia, the following material findings:

1. At the time of change of name from late Shri Jage Ram to Shri Randhir Singh (A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021), NOC from all land co-sharers, including Shri Rajender Singh, was not obtained, constituting a lapse on the part of the then Consumer Clerk.
2. The subsequent change of name / attribute correction in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi was effected through the RAPDRP/Billing system without following the prescribed procedure for Change of Name (CON), without obtaining the requisite documents proving ownership, and without deposition of processing charges, ACD and other applicable charges. The then Consumer Clerk was held responsible for these lapses.

The parties exchanged copies of the documents relied upon by them during the hearing. In order to ensure a complete and fair adjudication on merits, and having regard to the earlier Interim Orders dated 02.06.2026 and 04.08.2026, the following further directions are issued:

1. **Supply of Investigation Report** The Respondents shall forthwith supply a complete and legible copy of the investigation report of the XEN/OP Division, UHBVN, Samalkha, to both the Appellant and the impleaded party Shri Parveen Kumar, if not already supplied.
2. **Written Submissions** All parties (Appellant, impleaded party and the Respondents) shall file their respective written replies / affidavits, duly supported by relevant documents (including registry deeds, earlier affidavits/NOCs, Jamabandi, mutation records, and any other material relied

upon), on or before **24.08.2026**. The submissions shall specifically address the findings recorded in the investigation report and the compliance status of the directions issued vide the Interim Order dated 02.06.2026.

3. **Original Consumer File and Chronology** The Respondents are directed to trace out and produce the original consumer file pertaining to the release of the tubewell connection, along with a complete chronological sequence of all events, applications, name changes, attribute corrections, and orders relating to Account No. AP10-1024-X / T2-62. The Respondents shall also place on record the specific steps taken, or proposed to be taken, to rectify the procedural deficiencies and lapses identified in the investigation report, consistent with the Sales Circular issued from time to time regarding submission of NOC from legal heir and other applicable Nigam instructions / Supply Code provisions governing Change of Name.
4. **Status Quo** The status-quo directions issued vide Interim Order dated 02.06.2026 shall continue to operate until further orders. Electricity supply through the connection shall not be disconnected, and no coercive recovery action shall be initiated, subject to regular payment of current bills.

The matter is adjourned to **24.08.2026**.

J. On 17.08.2026, Sh. Praveen Kumar has requested as under:-

निम्न निवेदन यह है कि आपके द्वारा दिनांक-06.08.2026 को उक्त मामले की सुनवाई की गई थी। सुनवाई के दौरान शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा दिनांक-05.08.2026 का श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान से प्राप्त शपथ पत्र प्रस्तुत किया गया था। उक्त शपथ पत्र की फोटो प्रति मुझे आपके माध्यम से प्राप्त हुई थी, जो कि साथ संलग्न है। अतः मेरा आपसे अनुरोध है कि उक्त शपथ पत्र की सत्यापित प्रति उपलब्ध करवाई जाए ताकि मैं उक्त शपथ पत्र की जाँच पुलिस विभाग से करवाते हुए सत्य आपके सम्मुख प्रस्तुत कर सकूँ। श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान से प्राप्त उक्त शपथ पत्र व रजिस्ट्री में अंकित कथन विरोधाभासी हैं। इसके लिए मैं आजीवन आपका आभारी रहूँगा।

K. On 19.08.2026, Office has replied to Sh. Praveen Kumar as under:-

आपके पत्र का संदर्भ लिया जाता है, जिसमें आपने उपरोक्त अपील की सुनवाई दिनांक ०६.०८.२०२६ के दौरान अपीलार्थी द्वारा प्रस्तुत श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवर भान के शपथ-पत्र दिनांक ०५.०८.२०२६ की सत्यापित प्रति उपलब्ध कराने का अनुरोध किया है।

यह अवगत कराया जाता है कि दिनांक ०६.०८.२०२६ को हुई सुनवाई के दौरान समस्त पक्षकारों (जिसमें आप सम्मिलित पक्षकार के रूप में शामिल हैं) ने अपने-अपने द्वारा प्रस्तुत दस्तावेजों की प्रतियाँ एक-दूसरे को उपलब्ध कराई थीं। यह तथ्य अपील संख्या १६ सन् २०२६ में इस प्राधिकरण द्वारा पारित अंतरिम आदेश दिनांक ०६.०८.२०२६ में स्पष्ट रूप से अंकित है। उक्त शपथ-पत्र भी उन दस्तावेजों का भाग था जो सुनवाई के दौरान पक्षकारों के बीच आदान-प्रदान किए गए थे तथा यह इस फोरम के आधिकारिक अभिलेख पर उपलब्ध है।

उपरोक्त तथ्यों को दृष्टिगत रखते हुए, उक्त शपथ-पत्र की प्रतिलिपि आपको फोरम की उपस्थिति में पहले ही उपलब्ध कराई जा चुकी है। अतः अलग से कोई सत्यापित प्रति जारी किए जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

यह पत्र आपकी सूचना एवं अभिलेख हेतु जारी किया जाता है।

L. On 22.08.2026, respondent SDO has submitted is as under:

With reference to the subject cited above, it is submitted that the original consumer case file pertaining to the release of the Tubewell connection could not be traced in the available office records. The said connection is very old and was released before the year 1990. Due to the considerable age of the connection, the original consumer case file is presently not traceable in the office record.

As per the records available on the Nigam portal, the Tubewell connection was originally in the name of **Sh. Jage Ram S/o Sh. Gorbha Ram** and was subsequently changed in the name of **Sh. Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan**. The consumer case file/record available on the Nigam portal pertaining to the said change of name is enclosed herewith.

Thereafter, **Sh. Sandeep Kumar S/o Sh. Randhir Singh** applied for change of name of the Tubewell connection from his father, Sh. Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan, to his own name. However, the said application for change of name was cancelled by the office. The complete record available in this regard is also enclosed herewith.

Subsequently, the consumer name was again changed to **Smt. Nirmala Devi w/o Sh. Vijay Pal**. The record relating to the said change of name, as available in the office, is enclosed herewith. Further, the relevant order passed by the CGRF, Panchkula, pertaining to the said account is also enclosed for kind perusal and record. In view of the above, the available records/documents relating to the said consumer account are being submitted for kind information and further necessary directions, please.

M. On 23.08.2026, appellant has submitted written reply which is as under:-

In reply to order dated 06/08/2026 passed by Hon'ble Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana I Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan resident of village Garhi Bhallor, District Panipat consumer of UHBVN through AP Tubewell connection bearing account No. AP 10-1024-X under (OP) S/Divn UHBVN Biholi (Division Samalkha, Circle Panipat) humbly submitted and prayed as under: -

That in his investigation report Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha accepted that the Tubewell Connection was running in the name of Sh. Jage Ram S/o Sh. Gorbha Ram and he expired on 09.09.1989. Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Sh. Kanwar Bhan are his sons. Means thereby that these are legal heirs of Sh. Jage Ram.

Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha further submitted that Sh. Randhir Singh applied for change of name vide A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021. He submitted NOC on affidavit from Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Sh. Kanwar Bhan S/o Sh. Jage Ram. During investigation it is revealed that Sh. Kanwar Bhan was not the owner of land as well as tubewell connection because he had transferred the land in the name of his sons Sh. Rajender Singh and Sh. Randhir Singh. Accordingly, it was the necessity to get NOC from Sh. Rajender also.

Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha further submitted that during investigation it is noticed that Sh. Rajender Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan S/o Sh. Jage Ram sold his property to Smt. Nirmla Devi W/o Sh. Vijay Pal during the year 2011 with written statement in his registry that the tubewell connection having a/c No. T2-62 along with Kotha was also handed over to Smt. Nirmla Devi.

Here in reply to investigation report of Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha I Randhir Singh would like to submit as under: -

1. Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha submitted that Kanwar Bhan was not the owner of land as well as tubewell connection because he has transferred the land in the name of his sons Sh. Rajender Singh and Sh. Randhir Singh. Accordingly, it was the necessity to get NOC from Sh. Rajender also.

Reply: -

It is submitted that only land was transferred by Sh. Kanwar Bhan in favour of his sons Sh. Rajender Singh and Sh. Randhir Singh. Tubewell connection rights were not transferred in their favour. It was different process which was to be done/completed through UHBVN Department and that process was completed later on by Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Sh. Kanwar Bhan Sons of Sh. Jage Ram in favour of me (Sh. Randhir Singh) by filing/giving their NOC/Affidavit in UHBVN Department.

There was no need to take NOC from other Co-sharers i.e. Rajender Singh as Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Sh. Kanwar Bhan are sole legal heirs of Sh. Jage Ram and this fact has already been accepted by Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha in his investigation report. Hence, this allegation/objection raised by Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha is null and void.

2. Xen (OP) Divn UHBVN Samalkha submitted that during investigation it is noticed that Sh. Rajender Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan S/o Sh. Jage Ram sold his property to Smt. Nirmla Devi W/o Sh. Vijay Pal during the year 2011 with written statement in his registry that the tubewell connection having a/c No. T2-62 along with Kotha was also handed over to Smt. Nirmla Devi.

Reply: -

It is submitted that Sh. Rajender Singh has no right to sale the tubewell connection as he is not the connection holder. He is only owner of land and only land was transferred to him by Sh. Kanwar Bhan legal heir of Sh. Jage Ram. Hence, he has only right to sale his land not the connection to whom he is not the owner.

It is further submitted that now Sh. Rajender Singh has given an Affidavit (Annexure-A) stating therein that no tubewell connection was given with land because tubewell connection was not on his name. Tubewell connection is running on his grandfather Sh. Jage Ram's name. He has also not given his share from Khasra No. 39//27 in which tubewell bore is running.

It is also brought to your kind notice that said Sh. Rajender Singh has transferred the land comprising in Khasra No. 39//27 (in which Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) still exists) in my name through Transfer Deed dated 17/12/2024 (Annexure-B).

After the death of my grandfather, my father (Sh. Kanwar Bhan) and uncle Sh. Sukhbir Singh S/o Sh. Jage Ram being legal heirs of Sh. Jage Ram and his property, the said tubewell connection was transferred in my name and affidavits were also submitted by them in this regard in my favour. In case of death of real owner of agricultural tubewell connection, the tubewell connection can be transferred to the legal heir of the Tubewell Connection Holder. There is no hinderance in transferring the same as per rule of UHBVN on completing the required formalities.

The Tubewell connection can also be transferred if the land is sold, the connection can be transferred to the new owner. But in this case the sellers i.e Sh. Rajender Singh and Sh. Surta are only owners of the agricultural land from whom Smt. Nirmla Devi purchase the land. They are not the owners of the tubewell connection, hence they are not entitled to sell the tubewell connection to the purchaser.

The owner of the Tubewell Connection Sh. Jage Ram has already been died and his legal heirs Sh. Kanwar Bhan (my father) and Sh. Sukhbir Singh (my uncle) have already transferred the Tubewell Connection bearing No. AP10-1024-X in favour of me i.e. Randhir Singh by submitting their affidavit in the office of concerned Electricity Department Office. As the First

right of the said Tubewell Connection exists with sole legal heirs and they further transfer it to me being their legal heir, hence, there remains no question to further transfer the Tubewell connection in the name of Smt. Nirmla Devi.

Here I would like to draw your kind attention that as per Halka Kanungo Report submitted on 03.06.2023 and further certified on 18.07.2024 the tubewell premises and electricity pole is existing in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1, West-mid side and 39/27 East-mid side, the tubewell bore is situated.

It is pertinent to mention here that remaining part of the tubewell i.e. Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) is still exists in Khasra No. 39/27 (Photo already attached at Annexure-D with appeal) and appellant/complaint i.e. Randhir Singh is owner of Khasra No. 39/27.

Smt. Nirmla Devi has also 5/36 share i.e. 3 Marala 7 Sarsai (about 115 Yard/Gaj) in Khasra No. 39/27. She purchased the said land from Sh. Surta S/o Bishan Dutt. Earlier Sh. Kuda Ram S/o Sada Ram was the owner of said land and he sold the land to Sh. Balwan Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan and Sh. Balwan Singh sold the land further to Sh. Surta S/o Bishan Dutt and Sh. Surta Ram further sold the said land to Smt. Nirmala Devi. It all mention here to brought to your kind notice that Sh. Jage Ram tubewell connection holder has no relation with the land purchase by Smt. Nirmala Devi through which she is also claiming that she becomes the shareholder/owner of tubewell connection.

As far as, the question of existence of tubewell borewell is concerned the Tubewell Borewell exists on the Maind/Bund of Khasra No. 39/8/1/1/ and Khasra No. 39/27 i.e. on the land of Smt. Nirmla Devi and on the land of Appellant/Complainant Sh. Randhir Singh jointly.

The tubewell premises/electricity pole is existing in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1 as mentioned in Hon'ble CGRF order dated 30.08.2024. The remaining part of the tubewell i.e. Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) is still exists in Khasra No. 39/27 in the land of me i.e. Randhir Singh also. Hence, I/appellant have more weightage than opposite/other party being legal heir of the Tubewell Connection Holder as per instructions/guidelines of the UHBVN as well as being owner of Khasra No. 39/27 on which Discharge water Pipe (Dravery) and water tank (Chabcha) still exists. Merely on the basis of existence of pole in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1 does not prove that Smt. Nirmla Devi becomes entitle for transfer of tubewell connection in her name.

It is, therefore, prayed that kindly consider my appeal and a fair order based on the true facts may kindly be issued in favour of the appellant (Randhir Singh). The Tubewell Connection

holder Sh. Jage Ram has already been died and his legal heirs Sh. Kanwar Bhan (my father) and Sh. Sukhbir Singh (my uncle) have already transferred the Tubewell Connection bearing No. AP10-1024-X in favour of me i.e. Randhir Singh by submitting their affidavit in the office of concerned Electricity Department Office. As the First right of the said Tubewell Connection exists with sole legal heirs and they further transfer it to me being their legal heir, hence, there remains no question to further transfer the Tubewell connection in the name of Smt. Nirmla Devi merely on the basis that Electricity pole exists in Khasra No. 39/8/1/1. I shall be highly obliged and this shall ensure natural law of justice.

N. On 24.08.2026, Shri Praveen Kumar has submitted as under:-

विनम्र निवेदन यह है कि आपके कार्यालय के Memo No.-1780-1787/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 16/2026 dated-04.08.2026 की अनुपालना में आपको सानुरोध अवगत करवाना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा मेरी माताजी के नाम दिनांक-17.11.2011 को शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के सगे भाई श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान पुत्र श्री जागेराम निवासी गाँव गढ़ी भलौर, सब-तहसील बापोली, जिला-पानीपत से खेवट नं०-51/52 खतौनी नं०-60,61, मिजान हकीयत किते 22 रकबा तादादी 113 कनाल 17 मरले का 439/2277 भाग बकदर रकबा 21 कनाल 19 मरले खरीदा गया था। उक्त रकबे के साथ ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन टी2-62 समरसिबल 2/3 भाग मय कोठा 2/3 भाग मय मोटर-स्टार्टर, मेन स्विच 2/3 भाग इत्यादि खरीदे गए थे। उक्त कथन रजिस्ट्री में अंकित है। रजिस्ट्री व इंतकाल की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। दिनांक-17.11.2011 को जमीन व ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन टी2-62 बेचने वाला पक्ष श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान पुत्र श्री जागेराम (शिकायतकर्ता का सगा भाई) निवासी गाँव गढ़ी भलौर, सब-तहसिल बापोली, जिला-पानीपत बिजली विभाग में j.E. के पद पर कार्यरत था।

इसके पश्चात मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा मेरी माता जी के नाम वर्ष 2014 में श्री सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त पुत्र श्री बलवंत निवासी गाँव ताजपुर सब-तहसील बापोली, जिला- पानीपत से 39/27(1-7) का 5/36 भाग बाकदर रकबा 3 मरले 7 सरसाई खरीदते हुए इसके साथ में ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नं०-टी2-62 का ¼ भाग (जोकि शिकायतकर्ता रणधीर पुत्र कँवरभान के सगे भाई श्री बलवान सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त को बेचा गया था) भी साथ में खरीदा गया था। (श्री सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त के द्वारा श्री बलवान सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान से जमीन खरीदते समय ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नं०-टी2-62 का ¼ भाग भी खरीदा गया था उक्त तथ्य श्री सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त रजिस्ट्री में भी अंकित है जिसकी फोटो प्रति साथ सलंगन है) श्री सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त से प्राप्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नं०-टी2-62 के शपथ पत्र की प्रति व रजिस्ट्री की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। उक्त रजिस्ट्री में मेरी माताजी का नाम निर्मला देवी w/o श्री विजयपाल की जगह बिमला देवी w/o श्री विजयपाल होने के कारण उक्त भाग की ततीमा नामा (रजिस्ट्री) पुनः दिनांक-25.05.2023 को करवाते हुए मेरी माताजी का नाम ठीक करवाकर श्रीमती निर्मला देवी w/o श्री विजयपाल करवा दिया गया है। उक्त ततीमा नामा (रजिस्ट्री) करवाते समय भी पुनः ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नं०-टी2-62 का ¼ भाग का शपथ पत्र श्री सुरता पुत्र श्री बिशनदत्त से लिया गया था। उक्त ततीमा नामा (रजिस्ट्री, शपथ पत्र व इंतकाल की प्रति साथ सलंगन है।

मान्यवर, इसके पश्चात मेरे पिता जी के द्वारा उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन का बिजली बिल जोकि 1950 (एक हजार नौ सौ पचास रुपये था उक्त बिल दिनांक-30.03.2021 को जमा करवाया गया था। बिल की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। इसके पश्चात मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन का बिजली बिल जमा करवाने के लिए वर्ष 2022 में

बिजली विभाग कार्यालय में गए तो वहां जाने उपरांत पता चला कि उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को अगस्त 2021 श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के नाम कर दिया गया । इसके पश्चात मेरे द्वारा आर०टी०आई० लगाकर सभी दस्तावेज बिजली विभाग से प्राप्त किये गए, जिनको जांच करने के उपरांत पाया गया कि श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान व अन्य के द्वारा मिलीभगत व षडयंत्र के तहत अगस्त 2021 में बिजली विभाग से उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को खेवट नं०-39/27 भाग में दिखाकर आधे अधूरे दस्तावेजों के आधार पर अपने नाम करवा लिया गया है क्योंकि उक्त खेवट नं०-39/27 की

इसके पश्चात मेरे द्वारा उक्त मामले की शिकायत अधीक्षक अभियंता पानीपत व दो बार CM Widow पोर्टल पर की गई। किन्तु बिजली विभाग के जाँच अधिकारी के द्वारा मुझे जाँच में शामिल नहीं करते हुए गोलमोल जाँच रिपोर्ट उच्च अधिकारियों व CM Widow पोर्टल पर ATR के माध्यम से अपलोड कर दी गई। जिसकी प्रति साथ सलंगन है।

इसके पश्चात मेरी माताजी श्रीमती निर्मला देवी W/o श्री विजयपाल सिंह के द्वारा दिनांक-25.05.2023 को श्रीमान तहसीलदार साहब तहसील बापोली जिला पानीपत को प्रार्थना-पत्र देकर ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन, पोल, ट्यूबवेल कोठा व बोर के किला नं० की मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक करवाई गई थी। उक्त हल्का कानूनगो तहसील बापोली के द्वारा मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक के अनुसार खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 में उक्त ट्यूबवेल का कोठा व बिजली कनेक्शन पोल स्थित है तथा 39/8/1/1 की पश्चिम भुजा के मध्य एवं 39/27 की पूर्वी भुजा के मध्य यानि मेंढ के बीच 1 ट्यूबवेल बोर स्थित पाया गया । उक्त मौका पैमाइश के समय शिकायतकर्ता रणधीर पुत्र कँवरभान व शिकायतकर्ता का चाचा सुखबीर पुत्र जागेराम के साथ अन्य व्यक्ति मौके पर उपस्थित थे। जिसकी तसदीक मौका हाजिरी रिपोर्ट में हल्का कानूनगो के द्वारा लिए गए शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर पुत्र कँवरभान व शिकायतकर्ता का चाचा सुखबीर पुत्र जागेराम के हस्ताक्षरों से की जा सकती है, जोकि मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक की रिपोर्ट के साथ सलंगन है। उक्त सभी तथ्य साथ सलंगन है।

इसके पश्चात मेरे द्वारा उक्त मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक रिपोर्ट साथ सलंगन करके माननीय चेयरमैन CGRF UHBVN पंचकूला को लिखित पत्र के माध्यम से शिकायत करते हुए मेरी माताजी को न्याय देने व दोषी के विरुद्ध कानूनी कार्यवाही अम्ल में लाने बारे अनुरोध किया गया। जिसके उपरांत माननीय चेयरमैन CGRF UHBVN पंचकूला के आदेश क्रमांक-27/UH/CGRF-105/2024 दिनांक-30.08.2024 व पुनः आदेश क्रमांक-80/UH/CGRF-138/2025 दिनांक-27.02.2026 के तहत मुझे न्याय देते हुए सम्बंधित SDO के विरुद्ध कार्यवाही करने बारे आदेश पारित किये गए। किन्तु साजिशकर्ता श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के विरुद्ध कोई कानूनी कार्यवाही अम्ल में लाने बारे आदेश पारित नहीं किये गए । उक्त आदेशों की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। इसके लिए मैं चेयरमैन CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula का आजीवन आभारी रहूँगा ।

मान्यवर अब मैं आपका ध्यान निम्न तथ्यों की तरफ दिलवाना चाहता हूँ :-

1. मेरे पिता जी के द्वारा उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन का बिजली बिल जोकि 1950 (एक हजार नौ सौ पचास) रूपये था उक्त बिल दिनांक 30.03.2021 को जमा करवाया गया था। बिल की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। इसके पश्चात शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा साजिश रचते हुए अगस्त 2021 में उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को खेवट नं०-39/27 भाग में दिखाकर आधे अधूरे दस्तावेजों के आधार पर मिलीभगत व षडयंत्र के तहत अपने नाम करवा लिया गया है। उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा अपने नाम करवाते समय जो नक़लजमाबंदी वर्ष 2019-20 की

- लगायी गई थी उसके अनुसार उक्त जमीन के 4 हिस्सेदार दर्शाए गए थे, जोकि निम्न प्रकार से है:- 1. सुखबीर पुत्र जागेराम 2. राजेन्द्र पुत्र कँवरभान पुत्र जागेराम 3. सुरता पुत्र बिशनदत्त पुत्र बलवंत 4. रणधीर सिंह पुत्र कँवरभान । उक्त कनेक्शन को श्री रणधीर सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के नाम करते समय न तो सभी हिस्सेदारों में से श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र कँवरभान पुत्र जागेराम व सुरता पुत्र बिशनदत्त पुत्र बलवंत की कोई NOC नहीं ली गई है व जो शपथ पत्र कँवरभान-सुखबीर सिंह पुत्रान श्री जागेराम पुत्र गोरखा निवासी गढ़ी भालौर, तहसील बापोली जिला पानीपत का लगाया गया है। इन दोनों से अलग-अलग शपथ पत्र न लेकर एक ही शपथ पत्र पर दोनों के अंगूठे लगाये गए है। जो शपथ-पत्र भी संदेहस्पद है। क्योंकि उक्त नक़ल जमाबंदी साल 2019-2020 के अनुसार शिकायतकर्ता का पिता श्री कँवरभान पुत्र श्री जागेराम खेवट नं०-39/27 में हिस्सेदार ही नहीं था। इसके अतिरिक्त शिकायतकर्ता के चाचा श्री सुखबीर पुत्र श्री जागेराम के द्वारा खाता तकसीम के समय माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत को अंग्रेजी में हस्ताक्षर करते हुए लिखित बयान दिए हुए है कि प्रतिवादी नं०-2 व 3 रणधीर सिंह व राजेन्द्र सिंह का अलग एक ट्यूबवेल लगा हुआ है व उसके द्वारा अपना अलग से एक ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नं०-डी²-81 किला नं०-18/2 में अपनी लगत से लगाया हुआ है तो किस आधार पर वह पुनः उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन पर अपना दावा कर सकता है। उक्त लिखित बयान की प्रति साथ सलंगन है।
2. शिकायतकर्ता के द्वारा उक्त कनेक्शन को अपने नाम करवाते समय जो शपथ पत्र साथ सलंगन किया गया था उस शपथ पत्र पर जो दो व्यक्तियों के अंगूठे लगाये गए है उनमे से शिकायतकर्ता के चाचा श्री सुखबीर पुत्र श्री जागेराम के लगाये गए अंगूठे की जाँच लैब/पुलिस विभाग से करवाई जाये, क्योंकि शिकायतकर्ता के चाचा श्री सुखबीर पुत्र श्री जागेराम के द्वारा न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत को दिए गए जवाब व मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक में अंग्रेजी में हस्ताक्षर किये गए है तो उस समय उसके द्वारा अंगूठा क्यों लगाया गया । उक्त कथन की तसदीक साथ सलंगन शिकायतकर्ता के चाचा श्री सुखबीर पुत्र श्री जागेराम के लिखित बयान व मौका हाजिरी रिपोर्ट में हल्का कानूनगो के द्वारा किये गए अंग्रेजी में हस्ताक्षर से की जा सकती है।
 3. शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर सिंह के नाम करते समय विभाग को जमा करवाए गए मूल दस्तावेजों की भी जाँच करवाई जाये। मुझे पूरा संदेह है कि उक्त मूल दस्तावेजों को भी खुरद-बुरद न किया जा चुका हो ।
 4. माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत के द्वारा मुकदमा नं०-20/एन०टी० का फैसला दिनांक-16.04.2012 को सुनाया गया था जिसके अनुसार ही मेरी माता जी श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पत्नी श्री विजयपाल सिंह को खेवट नं०-67 खसरा नं०-39/ 1(5-4), 2/1(4-0) 8/1/1(3-0), 9/1-(7-0), 10(2-14) उक्त किला नं० प्राप्त हुए थे। जिसकी नक़ल जमाबंदी साल 2019-2020 साथ सलंगन है। उक्त किला नं० में से ही किला नं०-39/8/1/1 में ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन पोल, कोठा स्थित है तथा उसी किला नं०-39/8/1/1 की पश्चिम भुजा के मध्य एवं 39/27 की पूर्वी भुजा के मध्य यानि मेंढ के बीच 1 ट्यूबवेल बोर स्थित है। इसकी तसदीक हल्का कानूनगो, तहसील बापोली, पानीपत की मौका पैमाइश रिपोर्ट से की जा सकती है । मौका पैमाइश रिपोर्ट साथ सलंगन है ।
 5. माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत के द्वारा उक्त जमीन की खाता तकसीम की सुनवाई के दौरान दो बार आदेश दिए गए थे कि ट्यूबवेल जिसके हिस्से में स्थित हो उसी के कुरे में रखा जाये । उक्त आदेशों की प्रति साथ सलंगन है। इसके उपरांत ही शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत को दिनांक 10.01.2012 लिखित में सहमति (NOC) दी गई है। NOC की प्रति साथ सलंगन है।

6. मान्यवर जी, जब मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा दिनांक-17.11.2011 को उक्त जमीन खरीदने के पश्चात ही शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर के द्वारा दिनांक 10.01.2012 लिखित में NOC दी गई है तो शिकायतकर्ता के द्वारा किस आधार पर उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को किस आधार पर अपने नाम करवाया गया व अब पुनः उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन पर किस आधार पर दावा किया जा रहा है।
7. जब मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर के सगे भाई श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान पुत्र श्री जागेराम से दिनांक-17.11.2011 को उक्त जमीन व ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन टी2-62 का समरसिबल 2/3 भाग मय कोठा 2/3 भाग मय मोटर-स्टार्टर, मेन स्विच 2/3 भाग इत्यादि खरीदे गए थे उस समय श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान पुत्र श्री जागेराम (शिकायतकर्ता का सगा भाई) निवासी गाँव गढ़ी भलौर, सब-तहसिल बापोली, जिला-पानीपत बिजली विभाग में J.E. या S.D.O के पद पर कार्यरत था
8. अब दिनांक-06.08.2026 को आपके सम्मुख हुई सुनवाई के दौरान श्री रणधीर पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा अपने सगे भाई श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान से प्राप्त दिनांक-05.08.2026 को दिए गए शपथ पत्र की प्रति प्रस्तुत की गई। जिसमें यह दर्शाया गया है कि श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा अपने हिस्से की भूमि 21 कैनाल 19 मरले म हिस्सा ट्यूबवेल पानी मेरी माता जी श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पत्नी श्री विजयपाल पुत्र श्री रणधीर निवासी गाँव झट्टीपुर, जिला पानीपत को दी थी। अपनी भूमि के साथ कोई ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नहीं दिया था क्योंकि ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन उसके नाम नहीं था। जबकि श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा उक्त जमीन के साथ उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन टी2-62 समरसिबल 2/3 भाग मय कोठा 2/3 भाग मय मोटर-स्टार्टर, मेन स्विच 2/3 भाग भी बेचने बारे कथन मेरे पिताजी के द्वारा उक्त रजिस्ट्री में अंकित करवा दिया गया था। अब शिकायतकर्ता अपने सगे भाई श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह पुत्र कँवरभान से प्राप्त उक्त शपथ पत्र देकर मामले को उलझाने का प्रयास कर रहा है। क्योंकि उक्त शपथ पत्र में अंकित कथन व रजिस्ट्री में अंकित कथन विरोधाभासी है। इसकी जाँच करते हुए शिकायतकर्ता के सगे भाई श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के विरुद्ध भी कानूनी कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाये क्योंकि जिस समय मेरे पिता जी के द्वारा श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान की जमीन खरीदी गई थी उस समय शिकायतकर्ता का सगा भाई श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान बिजली विभाग में ही J.E या SDO के पद पर कार्यरत था। उक्त जमीन व ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को बेचते समय श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के बिजली विभाग में कार्यरत होने के कारण उसे ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन से सम्बंधित सभी नियमों की जानकारी थी। बिजली विभाग में होने के पश्चात भी यदि श्री राजेन्द्र पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा मेरी माताजी को उक्त जमीन के साथ ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन टी2-62 बेचने उपरांत अब वह ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन नहीं बेचने का शपथ पत्र किस आधार पर दे सकता है उसके विरुद्ध धोखाधड़ी व झूठा शपथ पत्र देने पर मुकदमा दर्ज करवाया जाए।

मान्यवर जी, मेरा आपसे आग्रह है कि उक्त सभी तथ्यों व मेरी माताजी के द्वारा करवाई गई हल्का कानूनगो तहसील बापोली से प्राप्त मौका पैमाइश/मौका तसदीक के अनुसार खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 में उक्त ट्यूबवेल का कोठा व बिजली कनेक्शन पोल स्थित है तथा उसी खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 की पश्चिम भुजा के मध्य एवं 39/27 की पूर्वी भुजा के मध्य यानि मेंढ के बीच 1 ट्यूबवेल बोर स्थित है। जिस खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 में कोठा व बिजली कनेक्शन पोल स्थित है वह खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत के द्वारा दिनांक-16.04.2012 को दिए गए आदेशानुसार मेरी माताजी के नाम है व खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 व 39/27 की मेंढ के बीच ट्यूबवेल बोर स्थित है उस 39/27 में भी मेरी माताजी वर्ष 2014 से हिस्सेदार है। शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर पुत्र श्री कँवरभान के द्वारा खाता तकसीम की सुनवाई के दौरान माननीय न्यायालय जनाब सहायक कलेक्टर प्रथम श्रेणी, बापोली जिला पानीपत के सम्मुख लिखित में दिनांक-10.01.2012 को NOC

देने उपरांत ही खसरा नं०-39/8/1/1 मेरी माताजी को प्राप्त हुआ था। जिसमें ट्यूबवेल कोठा व ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन पोल स्थित है। आपके द्वारा पूर्व में दिए गए आदेश क्रमांक.-5403-10/HERC/EO/Appeal No. 01/2025 dated-10.03.2025 के तहत दिए गए आदेश में सम्बंधित SDO बिहोली, समालखा, पानीपत के द्वारा दी गई अपनी टिपण्णी में सम्बंधित SDO के द्वारा आपको अवगत करवाया गया था कि शिकायतकर्ता श्री रणधीर के द्वारा विभाग को गुमराह करके उक्त कनेक्शन को अपने नाम करवाया गया था। उक्त कथन की तसदीक आपके द्वारा पूर्व में जारी आदेश से की जा सकती है। उक्त ट्यूबवेल कनेक्शन को मेरी माताजी के नाम करने बारे जो आदेश क्रमांक-27/UH/CGRF-105/2024 दिनांक-30.08.2024 के तहत दिए गए आदेश में उस समय मान्यवर जी आप चेयरमैन CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula के पद पर कार्यरत थे। इसके लिए मैं आपका आजीवन आभारी रहूँगा। मेरे द्वारा मेरी माताजी के साथ हुई इस धोखाधड़ी व साजिश की शिकायत माननीय पुलिस अधीक्षक पानीपत को कर दी गई है अतः मेरा आपसे पुनः अनुरोध है कि मेरी माताजी को न्याय देते हुए उनके साथ हुई धोखाधड़ी के लिए दोषी के विरुद्ध पुलिस कार्यवाही अम्ल में लाने की कृपा करें।

- O. The hearing in this matter was held on 24.08.2026 as scheduled. All the parties were present during the hearing.

DECISION

1. Nature of the Appeal

- 1.1 The present appeal has been preferred by Shri Randhir Singh under Regulation 3.32 of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended up to the 4th Amendment, 2024), assailing the order dated 27.02.2026 passed by the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVN, Panchkula in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-138/2025. That complaint itself arose on remand of the earlier proceedings in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-105/2024 (order dated 30.08.2024) pursuant to this Forum's order in Appeal No. 01 of 2025.
- 1.2 The dispute concerns the Agricultural Pump (AP) tubewell connection bearing Account No. AP10-1024-X (previously T2-62) under SDO (OP) Sub-Division, UHBVN, Beholi, Division Samalkha, Circle Panipat.

2. Prayer of the Appellant

The Appellant, in substance, prays that:

- (i) the change of name effected in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi be set aside;
- (ii) the CGRF orders dated 30.08.2024 and 27.02.2026 be quashed; and
- (iii) status quo ante be maintained pending determination of ownership of the underlying borewell by the competent Revenue Authority / Civil Court.

3. Brief Facts

- 3.1 The tubewell connection was originally released, prior to 1990, in the name of late Shri Jage Ram S/o Sh. Gorbha Ram. Shri Jage Ram expired on 09.09.1989, leaving

behind two sons — Shri Kanwar Bhan and Shri Sukhbir Singh — as his Class-I legal heirs under the Hindu Succession Act, 1956.

- 3.2 Shri Kanwar Bhan has three sons — Shri Rajender Singh (also referred to as Rajinder Singh), Shri Randhir Singh (the Appellant) and Shri Balwan Singh. Shri Balwan Singh sold his share of the ancestral land in 2007. Shri Sukhbir Singh has two sons — Shri Netar Pal and Shri Satpal. By a mutual family arrangement between the two branches, Shri Sukhbir Singh's branch continued to use the connection bearing Account No. D2-81, while the connection T2-62 (now AP10-1024-X) was used in respect of Sh. Kanwar Bhan's share.
- 3.3 By registered sale deed dated 17.11.2011 (Registry No. 1592, Book No. 1, Year 2011-12), Shri Rajender Singh sold 21 Kanal 19 Marla (his undivided share in the joint ancestral land comprising parts of Khasra Nos. 39/27, 39/8/1/1 and related khasras) together with 2/3 share of Tubewell Connection T2-62 (including kotha, motor, starter, main switch etc.) to Smt. Nirmala Devi W/o Sh. Vijay Pal for consideration. Possession was delivered on the spot and intkal was recorded. No application for change of name of the electricity connection was filed by Smt. Nirmala Devi at that stage.
- 3.4 Subsequently, in 2014 (followed by Tatima Nama dated 25.05.2023), Sh. Surta S/o Sh. Bishandatt (who is stated to have earlier purchased from Sh. Balwan Singh) sold a smaller parcel (3 Marla 7 Sarsai, being 5/36 share of Khasra No. 39/27) together with 1/4 share of Tubewell Connection T2-62 to Smt. Nirmala Devi. Affidavits of Sh. Surta confirm the sale of the said share of the connection. Name correction (Bimla to Nirmala) was effected via the Tatima Nama. Intkal was recorded. On the arithmetic advanced by the vendee's side, the cumulative shares claimed approximate 92 per cent of the connection. These registered instruments form the foundation of the claim advanced on behalf of Smt. Nirmala Devi (through Sh. Parveen Kumar).
- 3.5 Two successive changes of name were thereafter effected on the Nigam's records:
- (a) from late Sh. Jage Ram to Sh. Randhir Singh vide A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021, on the strength of affidavits of Sh. Kanwar Bhan and Sh. Sukhbir Singh alone; and
 - (b) from Sh. Randhir Singh to Smt. Nirmala Devi, pursuant to the CGRF order dated 30.08.2024 in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-105/2024, carried out through the RAPDRP/Billing "attribute correction" route without the prescribed Change of Name (CoN) formalities.
- 3.6 An intervening application by Sh. Sandeep Kumar S/o Sh. Randhir Singh seeking change of name from his father to himself was cancelled by the office (as recorded in the Nigam's Memo No. 1069 dated 22.08.2026).

3.7 Aggrieved by the transfer at 3.5(b), the Appellant approached the Corporate CGRF, which by the impugned order dated 27.02.2026 in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-138/2025 sustained the earlier order dated 30.08.2024. Hence the present appeal.

4. Proceedings before this Forum

4.1 On the appeal being registered, notices were issued and the matter was heard on 02.06.2026, 04.08.2026, 06.08.2026 and finally on 24.08.2026. The material directions passed in the interim orders were, in substance, as under:

- (i) Interim Order dated 02.06.2026 — impleadment of Shri Parveen Kumar (acting for Smt. Nirmala Devi); status quo of supply; a detailed investigation by the XEN (OP), Samalkha into both changes of name; a joint physical inspection with the Halka Kanungo/Tehsildar, Bapoli (with videography and drone mapping) of the borewell, motor room, discharge pipeline and water tank; and undertakings from all co-sharers/legal heirs to initiate khata takseem/mutation before the Revenue Authorities.
- (ii) Interim Order dated 04.08.2026 — supply of the investigation report of the XEN (OP), Samalkha to the Appellant and to Sh. Parveen Kumar; direction to all parties to attend prepared for final hearing on merits.
- (iii) Interim Order dated 06.08.2026 — production of the original consumer file; para-wise chronology; specific steps for rectification of the procedural deficiencies; written replies/affidavits with supporting documents by all parties; continuance of status quo on supply.

4.2 The XEN (OP), Samalkha investigation report has been placed on record and served on the parties. The Nigam's Memo No. 1069 dated 22.08.2026 (recording, inter alia, that the original consumer file is untraceable, the connection having been released prior to 1990) and the Appellant's reply dated 23.08.2026 have been received. Sh. Parveen Kumar has also filed his reply and supporting material, including the registered sale deeds and related revenue documents. All parties were heard at length on 24.08.2026.

5. Findings of the XEN (OP), Samalkha — Investigation Report

The Investigating Officer, after examining the record produced by the SDO (OP), Beholi, has recorded the following material findings:

- (i) At the time of the change of name from late Sh. Jage Ram to Sh. Randhir Singh vide A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021, NOCs were not obtained from all co-sharers/legal heirs — notably from Sh. Rajender Singh (and, on the pattern of the Nigam's own instructions, from Sh. Balwan Singh who had a stake as a legal heir at the material time). This constituted a clear lapse of the then Consumer Clerk.

- (ii) The subsequent change of name/attribute correction in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi was carried out through the RAPDRP/Billing system, without following the prescribed CoN procedure, without the requisite ownership documents, and without deposition of the processing charges, Advance Consumption Deposit (ACD) and other applicable charges — again attributable to the then Consumer Clerk.
- (iii) Both transactions stand in violation of the Sales Circular Memo No. 3787/CS/UH/BOD (156.30) dated 05.06.2013, in particular Clause 1.1.5, read with the Haryana Electricity Supply Code provisions governing Change of Name.

6. Position on the Ground — Location of the Infrastructure

From the revenue records, the Halka Kanungo's report (including the mauka verification of 25.05.2023) and the joint physical inspection (including digital drone mapping) placed on record, the following is established:

- (a) The borewell lies on the maind (common bund/boundary) between Khasra No. 39/8/1/1 (recorded in the name of Smt. Nirmala Devi) and Khasra No. 39/27 (in which the Appellant holds interest);
- (b) The concrete structure (kotha/motor room) is situated within the field of Smt. Nirmala Devi (Khasra No. 39/8/1/1);
- (c) The discharge pipeline (dravery) and the water tank (chabcha) exist within Khasra No. 39/27 of the Appellant.

7. Analysis

- 7.1 **The operative unit of the connection.** Under the standing instructions of the Nigam, the Sales Manual and the successive circulars (including the Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013), the basic unit for release and identification of an AP tubewell connection is the **borewell**, and not the concrete structure (kotha) housing the pump-set. The kotha, dravery and chabcha are ancillaries; they follow, and do not lead, the borewell.
- 7.2 **Devolution on the death of the original consumer.** On the demise of Sh. Jage Ram in 1989, the connection devolved on his two sons — Sh. Kanwar Bhan and Sh. Sukhbir Singh — as legal heirs. Any subsequent transfer or change of name was required, under the Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013 and the Supply Code, to be preceded by NOCs from all co-sharers/legal heirs and by proof of an inter-se partition or arrangement. Sh. Rajender Singh, being one of three grandsons through only one of the two branches, at no point held exclusive title to the connection.
- 7.3 **Effect of the registered sale deeds of 2011 and 2014.** The registered sale deed dated 17.11.2011 expressly recites the transfer of land **together with 2/3 share of Tubewell Connection T2-62** (including kotha, motor, starter etc.). The subsequent

2014 transaction (with Tatima of 2023) similarly recites transfer of a fractional land share **together with 1/4 share of the same connection**. These instruments are registered and have been placed on record. They cannot be ignored. At the same time, the recital of a fractional share in an electricity connection cannot, by its own force, confer on the vendee a better title than the vendor himself possessed. The principle *nemo dat quod non habet* applies with full vigour: the vendor could transfer only such interest as he himself held in the joint ancestral property. He could not, unilaterally and without the concurrence of the other coparceners/legal heirs, convey exclusive rights over an indivisible utility asset such as a single electricity connection whose borewell physically lies on the common maind.

7.4 **Indivisibility of the connection and the buyer's position.** A single electricity connection is, in the eye of the Nigam's regulatory scheme, a single indivisible unit. It cannot be pieced together by the arithmetic addition of fractional shares purchased from persons who themselves lacked exclusive title over the whole. Even taking the vendee's claim at its highest (approximately 92 per cent) which in the eyes of the forum, the cumulative arithmetic — $2/3 + (1/3 \times 1/4) = 3/4$ — does **not** yield an absolute unity in her favour. the connection remains subject to the rights of the remaining co-sharers until a completed partition by metes and bounds and mutation by the competent Revenue Authorities. The buyer, at the point of purchase in 2011 and thereafter, was under a duty to satisfy herself of the vendor's exclusive title over an indivisible utility- a classic application of the doctrine of *caveat emptor*. That duty was not fully discharged in the sense required for immediate recognition on the Nigam's service records without the prescribed CoN procedure and NOCs from all interested parties.

7.5 **The missing original consumer file.** The Nigam has, vide Memo No. 1069 dated 22.08.2026, admitted that the original consumer case file cannot be traced, on the plea that the connection was released prior to 1990. The custodial responsibility for the record vests in the licensee and cannot be visited on either private party. The unavailability of the file further reinforces the conclusion that neither of the two changes of name could have been validly effected without full recourse to the CoN procedure and complete NOCs.

7.6 **Displeasure with the manner of adjudication and implementation.** This Forum records its considered displeasure at:

- (i) the Corporate CGRF's failure to array and hear all interested parties (including the Appellant, Sh. Sukhbir Singh's branch and Sh. Balwan Singh) before directing the transfer in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi in 2024; and
- (ii) the mechanical implementation of those orders by the field officers through a mere "attribute correction" in the RAPDRP/Billing system, in complete

derogation of the standing CoN procedure and without recovering the statutory dues.

- 7.7 **Jurisdictional demarcation.** The question of title to the land and the borewell — being a *lis* in immovable property — lies within the exclusive province of the Revenue Authorities and the Civil Court. This Forum, exercising jurisdiction under Section 42(6) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended), confines itself strictly to the service dimension of the dispute and the compliance or non-compliance of the Nigam's own procedure by its officers. On that limited but decisive plane, both changes of name are found to be procedurally void *ab initio* for non-compliance with the Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013 and the Supply Code.

8. Decision

In view of the foregoing:

- (a) Both change-of-name transactions — namely
 - (i) from late Sh. Jage Ram to Sh. Randhir Singh vide A&A No. P-22-521-63 dated 21.05.2021, and
 - (ii) from Sh. Randhir Singh to Smt. Nirmala Devi pursuant to the CGRF order dated 30.08.2024 — are held to have been effected in breach of the prescribed procedure and are, to that extent, unsustainable and non est on the Nigam's records.
- (b) It is *prima facie* held, for the limited purpose of the electricity connection and without prejudice to any determination of title by the competent Revenue Authority/Civil Court, that Sh. Rajender Singh did not possess an exclusive right to transfer, in the 2011 sale deed, the tubewell connection along with the borewell — a jointly-held indivisible utility asset situate on the common maind — which had originally been released in the name of the common ancestor, Sh. Jage Ram, and had devolved on his legal heirs. The subsequent purchase of a further fractional share from Sh. Surta does not alter this foundational position for the purposes of the Nigam's service records.
- (c) The impugned order dated 27.02.2026 of the Corporate CGRF in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-138/2025 (and, to the extent it merely re-affirms it, the underlying order dated 30.08.2024 in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-105/2024) is set aside insofar as it upholds the change of name in favour of Smt. Nirmala Devi. The impugned order is otherwise modified in terms of the operative directions in paragraph 9.

9. Operative Directions

- i. **Restoration of the status quo ante.** The Respondents shall, within 15 days of receipt of this order, revert the entry in the billing/RAPDRP record for Account No. AP10-1024-X to reflect the position as it stood prior to the disputed transfers — i.e., in the name of late Sh. Jage Ram — with a suitable judicial annotation reading:
- “Subject to final determination of ownership by the competent Revenue Authority/Civil Court, in terms of the order of the Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana in Appeal No. 16 of 2026 dated 25.08.2026.”*
- ii. **Status quo on supply.** Electricity supply through Account No. AP10-1024-X shall continue uninterrupted. No coercive action for disconnection or recovery of arrears (save current consumption) shall be taken by the Nigam until the competent Revenue Authority/Civil Court finally determines ownership. Current bills shall be paid regularly by the party in actual possession/use of the connection; where use is disputed, a joint no-lien deposit account with the SDO (OP), Beholi shall be operated, receipts whereof shall be adjusted on final determination.
- iii. **Reference to the Revenue forum — outer limit.** The Appellant, Sh. Parveen Kumar (for Smt. Nirmala Devi) and all remaining co-sharers/legal of Late Sh. Jage Ram shall, in continuation of the undertakings filed pursuant to the Interim Order dated 02.06.2026, institute and diligently pursue proceedings for partition (khata takseem of Khasra No. 39/27) and consequential mutation before the competent Revenue Authorities within 60 days of receipt of this order. Any party failing to do so, without sufficient cause, shall be presumed to have abandoned its objection to the position of the billing record for the limited purposes of the Nigam.
- iv. **Sale of Tubewell Connection.** Furthermore, it has also been observed that the registered sale deed by which Sh. Rajender Singh sold a 2/3rd share of the tubewell connection along with its accessories, and Sh. Balwan sold a 1/4th share to Sh. Surta, is invalid in the eyes of this Forum. Sale and purchase of a single individual unit, i.e., an electricity connection, is not legitimate.
- v. **Recovery of unpaid statutory dues.** The SDO (OP), Beholi shall, within 30 days, quantify and recover the processing charges, Advance Consumption Deposit (ACD), and other CoN charges that were not deposited at the time of the disputed 2024 transfer, in accordance with the Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013 and the Supply Code, from the person(s) in whose favour the connection is ultimately reflected on the reverted billing record.
- vi. **Reconstruction of the missing consumer file.** The XEN (OP), Samalkha shall:
- (a) within 15 days, lodge an internal note fixing responsibility for the missing original consumer file; and
 - (b) within 45 days, undertake reconstruction of the file from sub-office records, RAPDRP data, and certified copies held by the parties, and place a compliance report before this Forum.

vii. **Disciplinary action.** The Superintending Engineer, UHBVN and the Chief Engineer (Operation), UHBVN, Rohtak shall initiate appropriate disciplinary proceedings under the applicable service rules against the officer(s)/official(s) responsible for:

- (a) misplacing the original consumer file; and
- (b) effecting the two changes of name without following the prescribed procedure, without complete NOCs, and without recovering the prescribed charges.

An action-taken report shall be submitted to this Forum within 45 days.

viii. **Systemic rectification.** The Respondents shall, within 30 days, place on record concrete steps taken/proposed to prevent recurrence, including:

- (a) disabling routine CoN through the RAPDRP/Billing “attribute correction” route absent a CoN application with full documentation;
- (b) a mandatory checklist and second-officer verification for CoN in AP connections involving deceased/original consumers; and
- (c) periodic compliance audit of the Sales Circular dated 05.06.2013.

ix. **Liberty and no expression on title.** Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on, or a declaration of, title over the land, kotha or borewell in question. The findings herein are confined to the service dispute and to the Nigam’s own procedural compliance. All parties are at liberty to agitate their respective claims of title before the competent Revenue Authority/Civil Court, and the Nigam shall abide by the final determination so rendered, subject to compliance with its own instructions.

10. Costs

Having regard to the fact that the primary lapse is traceable to the Nigam’s officers and not to the private parties, parties shall bear their own costs.

The appeal is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. All interim directions issued vide orders dated 02.06.2026, 04.08.2026 and 06.08.2026 stand merged in this final order.

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

Given under my hand on 31.08.2026.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)

Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana

Dated: 31.08.2026

CC:

Memo No.2055-2061/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 16/2026

Dated:31.08.2026

To

1. Shri Randhir Singh S/o Sh. Kanwar Bhan resident of village Garhi Bhallor, District Panipat (Email rtrk0123@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), UHBVN, Rohtak, 4th Floor Rajiv Gandhi Vidyut Bhawan near Medical Mor Delhi Road, Rohtak (email ceoprohtak@uhbvn.org.in)
5. The SE (Operations), Panipat, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana, Road Panipat (Email seoppanipat@uhbvn.org.in)
6. XEN (Operations), Samalkha, UHBVN, Near Jangra Dharamshala, Officers Colony, Samalkha (Email xenopsamalkha@uhbvn.org.in)
7. SDO/OP, Sub Division, UHBVN, Beholi, 132 KV Sub Station, G.T. Road, Samalkha (Email sdoopbeholi@uhbvn.org.in)
8. Sh. Parveen Kumar S/o Sh. Vijay Pal Village Chhattipur, VPO Machhrauli, Tehsil Samalkha, District Panipat (Mobile No. 7988355735)

