



BEFORE THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, HARYANA
Bays No. 33-36, Ground Floor, Sector-4, Panchkula-134109
Telephone No. 0172-2572299
Website: <https://herc.gov.in/Ombudsman/Ombudsman.aspx#>
E-mail: eo.herc@nic.in

E-Mail

Appeal No : 31 of 2026
Registered on : 10.09.2026
Heard on : 12.10.2026

In the matter of: -

Appeal against the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVN Panchkula in case No 26 of 2026

Sh. Raj Kumar Singal S/o Sh. Ram Parkash Singal, R/o House No. 147, **Appellant**
Sector-28A, Chandigarh

Versus

1. The XEN/OP City Division, UHBVN, Panipat.
2. SDO/OP, Sanoli Road Sub-Division, UHBVN, Panipat

Respondent

Before:

Shri Rakesh Kumar Khanna, Electricity Ombudsman

Present on behalf of Appellant:

Shri Bhavdeep Modi (Counsel for the appellant)

Present on behalf of Respondents:

Smt. Anjali Malik, SDO/OP, Sanoli Road Sub-Division, Panipat
Shri Sandeep Singh, SSA.

ORDER

- A.** Shri Raj Kumar Singhal has filed an appeal against the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in case no. 26 of 2026. The appellant has submitted as under: -
1. That the Appellant is the recorded consumer of a High Tension (HT) electricity connection bearing Account No. 8408740000 (old Account No. 223130HULS013700), installed at Plot No. 302, Sector-29, Part-II, Industrial Area, HUDA, Panipat, in respect of the erstwhile proprietorship concern M/s National Woollen & Furnishers. The connection was applied for and obtained by the Appellant, and the original Application & Agreement Form bears his photograph and the Certificate of Site Verification records him as the applicant/prospective consumer.
 2. That the Appellant is also the recorded owner of the aforesaid plot, as confirmed even by the Sub-Divisional Public Information Officer-cum-Estate Officer, HSVP, Panipat vide reply dated 27.04.2020 under the Right to Information Act, 2005, which categorically records: "The ownership of plot No. 302, Sector 29 P-II, Panipat is stand in your name as per record."
 3. That upon an application moved by the Appellant for permanent disconnection of the aforesaid electricity connection, the competent authority of Respondent No. 2 issued a Permanent Disconnection Order (PDCO) bearing No. 1050 dated 06.10.2025, thereby directing permanent disconnection of the connection. The Appellant was therefore entitled to have his connection disconnected effectively and immediately in terms of the said departmental order.

4. That instead of complying with its own PDCO No. 1050 dated 06.10.2025, Respondent No. 2 addressed a letter/Memo No. 907 dated 16.10.2025 to the Appellant alleging that he had “transferred the proprietorship” of the firm to his brother Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal with effect from 02.10.2014, and that Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal was accordingly “liable for all the liabilities and formalities” under the account, and that execution of the PDCO had therefore been “taken hold back.” It is pertinent to note that this claim was founded solely on a unilateral, unverified representation made by Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal, who is not, and never has been, the recorded consumer of the electricity connection in the books of Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.
5. That the Appellant submitted a detailed and satisfactory reply refuting the claim of Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal, reiterating that the electricity connection stands in his own name and reiterating his request for permanent disconnection in terms of the PDCO already issued.
6. That despite the lapse of more than 10 months from the date of PDCO No. 1050 and despite repeated requests, the Respondents failed and neglected to give effect to the PDCO, and the electric supply continued, and continues, to be supplied at the Appellant's HT Account without his consent, exposing him to continuing and open-ended billing liability for a connection he does not wish to operate.
7. That left with no alternative, the Appellant approached the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVN, Panchkula (“the Forum”), by way of Complaint No. UH/CGRF-26/2026, which was admitted on 12.02.2026. A copy of the complaint with supporting documents is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE A-1.
8. That Respondent No. 2/SDO(OP) Sanoli Road Sub-Division did not file any reply despite the first date of hearing on 09.03.2026, when the Appellant duly appeared before the Forum in person, and the Forum recorded this default seriously and directed a reply within four days, with a simultaneous copy to the Appellant to enable him to file a rejoinder.
9. That Respondent No. 2 thereafter filed its reply vide Memo No. 4702 dated 24.03.2026, which disclosed, inter alia, that: (a) after the PDCO was issued, Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal had submitted certain documents claiming proprietorship of the firm and that execution of the PDCO had accordingly been “taken hold back”; (b) a civil suit titled Suresh Kumar Vs Raj Kumar bearing Case No. CS/20/18, CIS No. 526 of 2018 is stated to be pending in the Court of the Ld. Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.), Panipat, and that vide order dated 24.05.2018 the parties thereto were “directed to maintain status quo till then”; and (c) that in view of the said suit, the connection “cannot be disconnected at this time” and “further action will be taken according to the Hon'ble Court's order/decision.” A copy of the Reply is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE A-2.
10. That, remarkably, Respondent No. 2 had already passed a self-contained internal Office Order No. 25 dated 09.03.2026 — the very date of the first hearing before the Forum — recording identical conclusions and holding that the connection “cannot be disconnected,” thereby disclosing that Respondent No. 2 had pre-determined the issue even before affording the Appellant any opportunity of being heard on the reply, in violation of the principles of natural justice.

11. That on the next date of hearing, i.e. 09.04.2026, the Appellant could not appear before the Forum, and the Forum, without examining the merits of the controversy or calling for the record/certified copy of the order dated 24.05.2018 relied upon by Respondent No. 2, or considering whether the said order continued to subsist and whether it bound the Nigam at all, proceeded to dismiss the Complaint vide the impugned order, holding that “since there is a Court Case still under trial..... nothing can be done by this Forum as there are clear cut orders for maintaining status quo. Hence the connection be allowed to continue till the decision of the Hon’ble Distt. Courts.”
12. That the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by the Forum (“the impugned order”), dismissing Complaint No. UH/CGRF-26/2026, is illegal, perverse, contrary to the record and the settled position of law, and is liable to be set aside for the reasons, among others, set out hereinbelow. A copy of the impugned order is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE A-3.
13. That the present appeal is filed under Section 42(6), 42(7) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with the applicable Regulations of the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission governing the Electricity Ombudsman. Since the appeal is beyond the normal period of limitation of thirty days prescribed for filing the same, an application for condonation of delay is being filed simultaneously herewith, for the reasons stated therein, which may kindly be read as part and parcel of this appeal.

B. GROUNDS OF APPEAL

Without prejudice to one another, the Appellant begs to prefer the present appeal, inter alia, on the following grounds:

- (A) Because the impugned order proceeds on a complete misreading and misconstruction of the order dated 24.05.2018 passed in CS/20/18 (CIS No. 526/2018).

The certified copy of the order dated 24.05.2018 available on record shows that the case was, on that date, adjourned “to 21.07.2018 for remaining ex-parte evidence of plaintiff,” and that “the parties are directed to maintain status quo till then.” The expression “till then” unambiguously confines the direction to the next date of hearing, namely 21.07.2018. It is an ad-interim, time-bound procedural direction incidental to an adjournment, and not a continuing or permanent injunction.

The order to maintain status quo was extended time to time by the Hon’ble Court till 17.5.2019 vide order dated 22.04.2019. Thereafter, no order extending, renewing or continuing the said direction beyond 17.05.2019 was passed by the Hon’ble Court and as such the order stood vacated essentially.

The Forum, without calling for or examining the subsequent order-sheet of CS/526/2018, mechanically accepted the bald assertion of Respondent No. 2 that “there is a stay order” and that “there are clear cut orders for maintaining status quo,” which is factually incorrect and contrary to the very document relied upon. A copy of relevant orders is annexed herewith as ANNEXURE A-4.

(B) Because Respondent-Nigam is not even a party to CS/20/18 (CIS/526/2018), and the status quo direction therein, even if assumed to subsist, binds only the parties thereto.

Without Prejudice to the other grounds of appeal, CS/20/18 is a suit for declaration along with mandatory and permanent injunction filed by Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal against Sh. Raj Kumar Singal (the Appellant) alone, concerning the title/ownership and proprietorship of Plot No. 302 and the firm M/s National Woollen & Furnishers. Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 are strangers to the said suit. A direction to two private litigants to maintain status quo inter se in a property suit creates no obligation whatsoever upon a statutory licensee such as Respondent-Nigam, which owes independent statutory duties to its consumers under the Electricity Act, 2003 and the Regulations/Sales Circulars framed thereunder. The Forum erred in extending the effect of a private inter se direction to bind a non-party statutory authority and to override its own departmental order (PDCO No. 1050).

(C) Because, in any event, no injunction restraining Respondent-Nigam from disconnecting the connection or from acting upon PDCO No. 1050 has been shown to exist.

It is admitted, and evident from the record placed before the Forum, that M/s National Woollen & Finishers, through Sh. Suresh Singal, instituted a separate civil suit in the year 2025 against Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Limited and its officers (Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 herein) specifically seeking a mandatory injunction directing change of the proprietor's name in the Nigam's records, and a permanent injunction restraining the Nigam from acting on the Appellant's application for disconnection. This is the suit which, if at all, directly concerns the electricity connection. However, no order of any court granting ad-interim or interim injunction in the said suit against Respondent-Nigam has ever been placed on record, either before the Forum or in the reply dated 24.03.2026. In the complete absence of any subsisting injunction specifically restraining Respondent-Nigam, there was no lawful impediment whatsoever to the Nigam giving effect to the Appellant's request and its own PDCO No. 1050.

(D) Because PDCO No. 1050 dated 06.10.2025 is a valid, subsisting departmental order which could not have been kept in abeyance by Respondent No. 2 on the informal say-so of a third party.

Once a Permanent Disconnection & Clearance Order is issued by the competent authority of the Nigam in accordance with its Sales Circulars and Sales Instructions governing permanent disconnection, it constitutes a valid administrative determination which continues to bind the Nigam until set aside, reviewed or recalled by a competent authority through a reasoned, speaking order after due process. Respondent No. 2 had no jurisdiction to unilaterally suspend execution of a validly issued PDCO on the strength of an informal representation and a set of documents produced by Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal — a person who is not, and was never, the recorded consumer of the connection qua Respondent-Nigam.

- (E) Because the Appellant, being the recorded consumer, alone was entitled to seek disconnection of the connection standing in his name, and the definition of “consumer” under Section 2(15) of the Electricity Act, 2003 is person-centric and not premises-centric.
- It is settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in K.C. Ninan v. Kerala State Electricity Board & Ors., 2023 SCC OnLine SC 663, that it is the consumer, and not the premises, who is supplied electricity and who bears rights and liabilities qua the distribution licensee, and that dues/liabilities do not automatically attach to premises absent an express statutory charge. Applying this principle, the electricity connection and the account remain referable to the Appellant as the recorded consumer; Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal, admittedly a stranger to the connection records, had no independent right recognised in law to compel continuance of a connection that is not his, against the wishes of the person in whose name it stands and who alone remains contractually and financially answerable to the Nigam for it. Even Respondent No. 2's own Memo No. 907 dated 16.10.2025 is addressed to, and proceeds on the basis of information sought from, the Appellant himself, showing that the Nigam's own record treats him as the consumer of the connection.
- (F) Because continued supply of electricity at the premises against the express wish of the recorded consumer, despite a valid PDCO, amounts to unauthorised continuance of supply and exposes the Appellant to open-ended liability without his consent.
- The Appellant cannot, in law, be compelled to continue holding an electricity connection, and the attendant civil/contractual liability for consumption charges, against his express written request for disconnection, more so once his own request has already culminated in the issuance of PDCO No. 1050. Every day of delay in execution of the PDCO causes continuing prejudice to the Appellant and unjustly benefits Sh. Suresh Kumar Singal / M/s National Woollen & Furnishers, who continue to enjoy uninterrupted electricity supply on the Appellant's account without any legal sanction therefor once the connection-holder has sought its disconnection.
- (G) Because the Forum, being a statutory adjudicatory body constituted under Section 42(5) of the Electricity Act, 2003, was obliged to examine and decide the grievance on its merits and could not abdicate its adjudicatory function by mechanically treating a stale, time-bound litigation order as an absolute bar.
- The impugned order does not examine the validity, scope or continuing effect of the order dated 24.05.2018; does not examine the validity or binding effect of PDCO No. 1050; and does not examine whether Respondent No. 2 had any lawful authority to withhold execution of its own departmental order. This amounts to non-application of mind and complete abdication of the statutory adjudicatory function entrusted to the Forum, rendering the impugned order unsustainable.
- (H) Because the impugned order was passed in violation of the principles of natural justice.

Respondent No. 2's own internal Office Order No. 25 is dated 09.03.2026 — the very date of the first hearing before the Forum — and records conclusions identical to those in the reply dated 24.03.2026 filed thereafter, demonstrating that Respondent No. 2 had already closed its mind on the issue before the Appellant could even respond to any reply. Further, the Appellant was proceeded against and the Complaint was finally disposed of on 09.04.2026 without the Forum examining whether the reply dated 24.03.2026 and its enclosures (including the order dated 24.05.2018) had, in fact, been duly supplied to the Appellant in sufficient time to enable him to file an effective rejoinder, as had been assured by Respondent No. 2 itself before the Forum on 09.03.2026.

- (I) Because the impugned order is contrary to the Sales Circulars/Sales Instructions and the Electricity Supply Code framed by the Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission, which mandate a time-bound process for permanent disconnection of connections at the instance of the consumer once formalities are complete.

The Respondents have failed to demonstrate any outstanding dues, arrears or non-compliance on the part of the Appellant that could lawfully justify withholding execution of PDCO No. 1050 for over three months and continuing. The prolonged, unexplained inaction of the Respondents in giving effect to their own departmental order is wholly arbitrary and contrary to the applicable Sales Circulars/Instructions and the HERC (Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2014.

- (J) Because the impugned order causes grave and irreparable prejudice to the Appellant, who continues to remain saddled with an electricity connection and its attendant liabilities in his own name, over which he has neither control nor consent to its continuance, pending final adjudication of the property dispute between the parties in the civil courts, a process that, on the Respondents' own showing, has already continued without resolution since 2018.

The balance of convenience and equity lies squarely in favour of the Appellant, who has done nothing more than seek execution of an order already passed in his own favour by the competent authority of the Nigam itself.

PRAYER

In view of the facts and circumstances stated above, it is most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Ombudsman may graciously be pleased to:

- (a) set aside/quash the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by the Corporate Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVN, Panchkula in Complaint No. UH/CGRF-26/2026;
- (b) allow the original Complaint No. UH/CGRF-26/2026 and direct Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to forthwith give effect to PDCO No. 1050 dated 06.10.2025 and permanently disconnect HT Account No. 8408740000 at Plot No. 302, Sector-29, Part-II, Industrial Area, HUDA, Panipat;
- (c) in the alternative, remand the matter to the Forum for fresh adjudication on merits, with a direction to call for and examine the complete record of CS/20/18 and the 2025 suit against the Nigam, and to decide the Complaint afresh after affording due opportunity of hearing to the Appellant;

- (d) pass such other and further order(s) as this Hon'ble Ombudsman may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case, in the interest of justice.
- (ii) Accordingly a notice of motion in the matter was issued by admitting the instant appeal as Appeal no.31 of 2026 on dated 10.09.2026 the matter vide memo no. 2163/EO/HERC/Appeal No. 31/2026 dated 10.09.2026 with scheduled date of hearing as 30.09.2026
- (iii) As per the request made by the respondent SDO Op, S. Divn, UHBVN, Panipat the matter was rescheduled and listed for hearing on dated 06.10.2026 at 11:00 am. The hearing in the matter was held on dated 06.10.2026 as scheduled which was attended by the respondent SDO Operation and the counsel for the appellant physically.
- (iv) After hearing both the parties in detail, documents submitted in the matter and documents submitted in the matter the following order is pronounced.

ORDER

1. The present appeal has been preferred by Sh. Raj Kumar Singhal (hereinafter "the appellant") against the order dated 22.04.2026 passed by the CGRF, UHBVN, Panchkula in Case No. 31 of 2026. The substance of the relief sought by the appellant is the change of name and disconnection of the electricity connection bearing Account No. 8408740000, which, as per the PDCO record supplied by the respondent SDO/OP, stands in the name of "M/s National Woollen and Furnisher, Director Sh. Raj Kumar Singhal S/o Sh. R.P. Singhal, 302/29, P-II, HUDA, Panipat".
2. The matter was heard as scheduled. The appellant was represented by his counsel Sh. Bhavdeep Modi, and the respondents were represented by Smt. Anjali Malik, SDO/OP, Sanoli Road Sub-Division, Panipat, assisted by Sh. Sandeep Singh, SSA. The submissions of the parties, the record placed before this forum, and the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions have been carefully considered.
3. Submissions of the Appellant. The learned counsel for the appellant raised, at the threshold, the concern that since the electricity connection in question carries his name (as Director of the firm on the PDCO and the electricity bill), any default by the actual user of the premises would fasten financial liability upon him. He fairly conceded, however, the following material facts:
 - (a) A civil suit concerning the ownership of the firm M/s National Woollen and Furnisher is pending adjudication before the Civil Court, Panipat, bearing Case No. CS-120/2018, in which the respondent licensee (UHBVN) is not a party;
 - (b) As on date, the legal possession of the premises where the subject connection is installed is with the other party (Sh. Suresh Kumar Singhal), and not with the appellant; and
 - (c) He sought time to confirm the particulars of the civil suit instituted by Sh. Suresh Singhal against UHBVN touching the subject connection.

4. Submissions of the Respondents. The respondent SDO/OP submitted that the electricity connection stands in the name of the firm "National Woollen and Furnisher" and that the matter is subject to a stay order of the Civil Court, Panipat. Upon being called upon by the appellant's counsel to specify the date of grant of stay, the respondents were unable to demonstrate that any stay had been granted after 2019. The respondents further informed — being a party thereto — that Civil Suit No. CS-1206-2025, titled M/s National Woollen vs. UHBVN, is pending before the Civil Court, Panipat, and the next date of hearing therein is 28.10.2026.
5. Issues for consideration. On the admitted factual matrix, two questions arise for determination:
 - (i) Whether the appellant answers the description of a "consumer" entitled to seek the relief of disconnection of the subject connection; and
 - (ii) Whether, in view of the pendency of civil proceedings covering the same subject matter, this forum can lawfully entertain and adjudicate the present appeal.
6. Whether the appellant is a "consumer". Regulation 1.5(f) of the HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended by the 1st Amendment, 2022) adopts the definition of "consumer" under Section 2(15) of the Electricity Act, 2003, whereby a "consumer" is a person who is supplied with electricity for his own use by a licensee, and includes any person whose premises are for the time being connected for the purpose of receiving electricity. The statutory definition thus pivots on actual supply, use, and connection of the premises. On the appellant's own showing, the premises in question are, as on date, in the legal possession of Sh. Suresh Kumar Singhal, who is the person actually using the electricity supplied through Account No. 8408740000. The appellant, therefore, is not the person "for the time being" supplied with electricity at the said premises; at best, he is a person whose name continues to figure in the record of the licensee as Director of the firm. The determination of whether he is, or remains, entitled to be treated as the consumer is inextricably linked to the ownership of the firm, which is itself the subject matter of the pending Civil Suit No. CS-120/2018. This forum is not the appropriate adjudicatory authority to resolve disputed questions of title, ownership of a partnership/firm, or possession of premises — matters which lie squarely within the domain of the civil court.
7. Maintainability — the sub judice bar. Even otherwise, the jurisdiction of this forum stands barred by the express mandate of the HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020:
 - (a) Regulation 2.15 of the Principal Regulations (as substituted by the 1st Amendment Regulations, 2022) provides that the Forum shall not entertain a complaint for which any proceedings are pending before any Court, Authority or any other Forum established by law; and Regulation 2.24(a) mandates rejection, through a speaking order, where proceedings in respect

of the same matter are pending before any court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority.

- (b) In *pari materia*, Regulation 3.18(iv) of the Principal Regulations, 2020 enjoins that no representation to the Ombudsman shall lie where the representation, in respect of the same grievance, is pending in any proceedings before any court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority, or where a decree, award or final order has been passed by any such forum.
8. Applying the aforesaid provisions to the facts at hand, it is evident that the grievance projected in this appeal — change of name and disconnection of electricity supply at the premises of M/s National Woollen and Furnisher, Panipat — is the very subject matter of Civil Suit No. CS-1206-2025 (M/s National Woollen vs. UHBVN) pending before the Civil Court, Panipat, instituted by the person who is admittedly in legal possession of the premises. The relief of disconnection, if granted by this forum, would directly and immediately affect the business interests of the firm and of the party in possession, who has already sought the protection of the civil court. Any adjudication by this forum on the said relief would amount to a parallel adjudication on a matter *sub judice*, would trench upon the proceedings pending before the civil court, and would expose the parties to the risk of conflicting outcomes. Such a course is impermissible under the Regulations and would be *ultra vires* the jurisdiction of this forum. Judicial discipline and the interest of justice alike require that the matter be left to the seisin of the civil court.
9. Findings. In the light of the foregoing discussion, this forum records as under:
- (i) The connection bearing Account No. 8408740000 stands recorded in the name of "M/s National Woollen and Furnisher, Director Sh. Raj Kumar Singhal", while the premises are admittedly in the legal possession of another party, who is the actual user of the electricity supplied;
 - (ii) The question as to who is entitled to be treated as the "consumer" within the meaning of Section 2(15) of the Electricity Act, 2003 read with Regulation 1.5(f) of the Regulations is inseparable from the dispute regarding ownership of the firm and possession of the premises, both of which are pending adjudication before the Civil Court, Panipat (CS-120/2018 and CS-1206-2025);
 - (iii) The subject matter of this appeal being directly and substantially in issue in the pending civil proceedings, the present appeal is not maintainable before this forum by virtue of Regulation 3.18(iv) of the HERC (Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2020 (as amended from time to time), read in harmony with the corresponding bar applicable to the Forum under Regulations 2.15 and 2.24(a).

10. Operative Order.

In view of the findings recorded above, the present appeal is disposed of as not maintainable at this stage, without adjudicating the merits of the grievance, with the following directions and observations:

- (a) The appellant is at liberty to seek impleadment as a party in Civil Suit No. CS-1206-2025 pending before the Civil Court, Panipat, and/or to pursue his remedies before the civil court, where his grievance regarding change of name and disconnection can be addressed in a comprehensive manner along with the claims of all interested parties;
- (b) The respondents are directed to act strictly in accordance with such orders as may be passed by the civil court in the pending suits, and to maintain the record of the subject connection in accordance with law;
- (c) Nothing in this order shall be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the respective claims of the parties, which are left to be determined by the competent civil court.

11. The appeal is disposed of accordingly. A copy of this order be sent to both the parties for compliance/information.

File be consigned to record after due compliance.

Given under my hand on 12.10.2026.

Sd/-

(Rakesh Kumar Khanna)

Electricity Ombudsman, Haryana

Dated: 12.10.2026

Memo No.2476-2482 /EO/HERC/Appeal No. 31/2026

Dated:12.10.2026

To

1. Sh. Raj Kumar Singal S/o Sh. Ram Parkash Singal, R/o House No. 147, Sector-28A, Chandigarh (Email aarkaychd1@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) Circle Panipat, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana, Road Panipat (Email seoppanipat@uhbvn.org.in)
6. The XEN (Operations,) City Division, Panipat, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana, Road Panipat (Email xenopcitypanipat@uhbvn.org.in)
7. SDO/OP Sanoli Road Sub-Division, 132 KV Sub Station, Gohana, Road Panipat (Email sdoopsanoliroad@uhbvn.org.in)