



\$~72

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

% **Date of Decision: 16th October, 2025**

+ W.P.(C) 15965/2025 & CM APPL. 65339/2025

HARISH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Adv.

versus

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Rohit Kathuria, Adv. for MCD
Mr. Rishab Raj Jain and Ms. Kirti
Garg, Advs. for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (ORAL):

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking directions to respondent no. 1-Municipal Corporation of Delhi ("MCD"), to decide the representations dated 15th March, 2021 and 15th June, 2021 of the petitioner and consequently direct the respondent no.2 to install the electricity connection in the property of the petitioner situated at *Third Floor, B2/182, Yamuna Vihar, New Delhi-110053*.
2. At the outset, learned counsel appearing for respondent no.2 submits that respondent no. 2 has been wrongly impleaded as BSES Rajdhani Power Limited. He submits that the correct nomenclature of respondent no.2 in the present writ petition, would be BSES Yamuna Power Limited, on account of the location of the property in question.
3. It is so noted.



4. Considering the submissions made before this Court, the name of respondent no.2 is amended to BSES Yamuna Power Limited.
5. Let Amended Memo of Parties be filed by the petitioner within a period of one week, from today, which shall be placed by the Registry in the present file.
6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the owner of the property bearing *No. B2/182, Third Floor, Yamuna Vihar, New Delhi-110053*. It is submitted that the representations of the petitioner dated 15th March, 2021 and 15th June, 2021, have not been decided by the MCD.
7. Likewise, petitioner's representation dated 20th September, 2025 has not been decided by respondent no. 2.
8. It is submitted that the petitioner had applied for an electricity meter connection with respondent no. 2 for the property in question, however, the application of the petitioner got rejected on the ground that the property was booked by the MCD *vide* booking *No. 22/B-I/UC/SH-N/2017* dated 19th January, 2017.
9. However, it is submitted that the petitioner sent a representation clarifying that the unauthorized construction in the building had already been demolished earlier. Further, new construction as per the applicable norms had been carried out.
10. Thus, it is submitted that the application of the petitioner for electricity connection in the premises in question, cannot be rejected on the basis of a booking entry, which is old.
11. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned counsels appearing for the respondents.



12. Learned counsel appearing for respondent-MCD submits that booking of the property in question for unauthorized construction already stands deleted, as action against the unauthorized construction existing in the property in question, had already been taken at an earlier point of time.

13. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to apply afresh for electricity connection with respondent no. 2 within a period of one week, from today. Upon the application of the petitioner for electricity connection, the same shall be considered by respondent no. 2, in accordance with law.

14. It is directed that in view of the submissions made by learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1, the respondent no. 2 shall not raise any objection as regards any unauthorized construction existing in the property in question.

15. However, other codal and commercial formalities shall be complied with by the petitioner, in terms of any directions that may be issued by respondent no. 2

16. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition, along with the pending application, is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025/KR