



HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION  
S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017  
Website- <https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/> Telephone: 0172-2711050

**(Through E-mail Only)**

Letter no. HRTSC/Comp-154/Energy/2025 /224 Dated 04. May 2026  
To

The SDO, Sub-division (electricity),  
Sector 56, Gurugram.  
E-mail ID: sdoopsector56@dhbvn.org.in

The SHO, Sector 56, Gurugram.

**Subject:- HRTSC/Comp-154/Energy/2025 - Complaint regarding Service Refund of Advance consumption Deposit / Consumption security/ meter security on closure of account after adjustment of all dues - Within 30 Days - Sh. Mandeep Authorized Signatory of M/s Ragamrit Buildcon Pvt Ltd.**

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of the orders dated 25.02.2026 passed by Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission, Chandigarh in respect of above case for information and necessary action.

**BY THE ORDER OF THE HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION AT CHANDIGARH.**

Encl: As above

(Sube Khan)

Under Secretary-cum-Registrar,  
Haryana Right to Service Commission  
E-mail: [rtsc-hry@gov.in](mailto:rtsc-hry@gov.in)

CC:-

- i. The Managing Director, DHBVN.
- ii. Sh. Vikas Kadian, XEN, DHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of DHBVN E-mail: [kadianvikas@yahoo.com](mailto:kadianvikas@yahoo.com).
- iii. The President, Freedom Park Life AOA E-mail: [fpl.adm.office@gmail.com](mailto:fpl.adm.office@gmail.com)
- iv. The complainant Sh. Mandeep Authorized Signatory of M/s Ragamrit Buildcon Pvt. Ltd. Phone No. 9888292728 E-mail ID: [ragamrit@gmail.com](mailto:ragamrit@gmail.com).



HARYANA RIGHT TO SERVICE COMMISSION  
S.C.O. No. 38 & 39 (2nd FLOOR), SECTOR 17-A, CHANDIGARH-160017  
E-mail: - <https://haryana-rtsc.gov.in/> Telephone: 0172-2711050

### **Final orders**

#### **(In respect of Complaint Case No. HRTSC/Comp-154/Energy/2025 - Complaint regarding Service Billing Complaints - 7 Days - Sh. Mandeep Authorized Signatory of M/s Ragamrit Buildcon Pvt Ltd.**

These orders are in continuation of the interim orders dated 31<sup>st</sup> October, 2025, issued vide the Commission's letter no. 4619 dated 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2025 wherein the hearing was held on 30<sup>th</sup> October, 2025 at 12 Noon. The operative part of the said orders is reproduced as under: -

*"The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. The arguments made by the XEN in the reply dated 24.10.2025 are noted, and it is shocking to observe that the RWA has indulged in profiteering in the name of DHBVN. As per Sales Circular D-23/2022, while the RWA has been provided a single-point electricity connection for which it also receives a discount, the individual consumers i.e., members of the society, can be charged for electricity consumption only as per the tariff approved by HERC. Moreover, the RWAs are required to generate bills through the unified billing software provided by DHBVN under Clause XIII of the ibid circular. Surprisingly, as per the statement of the XEN, the RWA has charged the complainant for electricity charges, common area charges, DG charges and maintenance charges in a combined and dubious manner, disguising them under the head of electricity charges. Furthermore, the RWA has charged MMC on the higher side as compared to the tariff issued by HERC. This clearly indicates that the RWA has deliberately avoided generating bills through the unified billing software of DHBVN, which, as confirmed by the XEN, is available to all societies and has instead devised its own system to overcharge the residents. The complainant has also stated that he was compelled to pay these amounts, including the maintenance charges, at the time of the sale of the flat and that the buyer was none other than the President of the RWA, namely Ms. Savitri Devi. While the Commission is not fully aware of the facts of this transaction or the name of the President of the RWA, it is evident from the reply dated 24.10.2025 that the complainant has been overcharged. It is the duty of DHBVN authorities to ensure that consumers are not charged tariffs exceeding those approved by HERC. For this purpose, the concerned SDO has been granted full access to the records of the society maintained by the RWA under Regulation XII of the said circular. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to ensure that the RWA charges electricity tariffs strictly as per HERC approved rates and refunds the excess amount to the complainant within 30 working days from the date of this order. This case assumes significance as hundreds of single-point connections have been released across the State to various societies managed by RWAs. The RWAs cannot be permitted to fleece consumers by levying unauthorized charges beyond the permissible tariff structure under HERC*

*Regulations. The Commission is also surprised to note that the RWA, while raising bills, has cited Section 27(1) of the 'Indian Electricity Act, 1910' — a provision and an Act that stands repealed. This clearly shows that the RWA is using a billing format that is legally untenable and has devised its own system to mislead and deceive the members of the society. This being the first such case before the Commission, it warrants a detailed investigation to ensure that consumers of group housing societies across the State are not overcharged by their respective RWAs. The Managing Directors, DHBVN and UHBVN are requested to submit details of the measures taken to ensure that all RWAs generate bills only through the unified billing software provided to them under Clause XIII of the circular. They should also consider issuing directions to all RWAs to use only the said software for billing purposes and to refrain from clubbing any other charges with energy charges. This will ensure that consumers can clearly distinguish between energy charges and other payments related to maintenance or additional facilities. They are requested to submit their comments in this regard to the Commission by 01.12.2025."*

2. In pursuance of the aforesaid interim directions, replies were received from CE (Commercial), DHBVN vide memo no. Ch-04/SE/C/370/2015/Vol-XIV/L-90 dated 01.12.2025 and from the concerned XEN vide memo no. 8315 dated 11.12.2025 and 8514 dated 23.12.2025. DHBVN informed that directions had been issued to all Superintending Engineers to ensure that RWAs do not overcharge consumers and that billing is carried out only through approved systems. However, compliance was initially reported from only one circle and additional time was sought for submission of a consolidated Action Taken Report (ATR). No reply was received from UHBVN at the initial stage. Subsequently, time extensions were granted by the Commission and reminders were issued. The replies received from the XEN indicated that the concerned RWA had sought time and later requested an opportunity of personal hearing before any final decision. The RWA claimed that billing was carried out as per its understanding and requested DHBVN to take over the billing process, while disclaiming any role in private financial transactions. UHBVN vide letter dated 26.12.2025 informed that a Unified Billing Software (UBS) for RWAs was under development and proposed to be operational w.e.f. 01.04.2026. DHBVN later vide letter dated 29.12.2025 informed that the UBS had been operationalized and that 368 RWAs were onboarded. However, only 10 RWAs had started generating electricity bills through the system as on date.

3. Therefore, to proceed further in the matter and on the request of the FPL AOA Management, a hearing was scheduled to be held before Sh. T.C. Gupta, Chief Commissioner, Haryana Right to Service Commission on 09.01.2026 at 12 noon vide letter no. 31 dated 02.01.2026. The hearing was held as scheduled, which was attended by the following: -

- i. Sh. Vikas Kadian, XEN, DHBVN, Nodal Officer for RTS matters on behalf of DHBVN.
- ii. Sh. Vikas Yadav, the SGRA-cum-XEN(Op), Division (Electricity), Sub Urban Gurugram, DHBVN.
- iii. Sh. Pulkit Goyal, the FGRA-cum-SDO(Op), Sub-Division (Electricity), Sector-56, Gurugram, DHBVN.
- iv. FPL AOA Management **(led by Sh. Sanjay Gupta, President)**

4. The hearing was held. Before passing any order in this regard, certain information was required to be obtained from the FPL AOA Management. Therefore, the Commission vide letter no. 284 dated 16.01.2026 and reminder letter no. 411 dated 28.01.2026 requested the President, Freedom Park Life AOA to apprise the Commission on the following points:-

- i. In whose name DHBVN has released the single-point electricity connection and who is making payment of the electricity bills, including those pertaining to Tower 'J'?
- ii. What is the mechanism in place for making regular payment of electricity bills to DHBVN?
- iii. It was stated during the hearing that an amount of Rs. 10,16,381/- deducted by Ms. Savitri Devi, buyer of Flat No. PH01 from the complainant company has not been deposited with your RWA, which is under an obligation to pay the electricity dues. Please confirm the same. A copy of the sale deed, as shared by the complainant with the Commission, is enclosed in this regard.
- iv. It was stated during the hearing that Sh. Manoj S/o Smt. Savitri Devi had physically assaulted members of your RWA in the past. Was any formal complaint / FIR registered with the police in this regard?
- v. Any other information you would like to share.

5. A reply was received from President, FPL AOA on 02.02.2026 while stating the following:-

- i. BPTP Park Life RWA had forcibly taken over the management of Plot B (Tower G,H,J) under the threat of physical harm to the team.
- ii. DHBVN released the single point connection in the name of M/s Countrywide Promoters. This connection supplies electricity to all nine towers. The name continues to be in the name of Countrywide Promoters since there are disputes related to the transfer of the fixed deposit. FPL AOA has been making payments to DHBVN. FPL AOA raises bills to all the nine towers.
- iii. FPL AOA collects electricity charges from the residents of all nine towers by raising monthly bills. They have adopted the practice of arriving at a per unit cost by dividing the total bill for the month by the total consumption. Due to threats, they have been adding the common area electricity alongwith the electricity bill on these three towers. It has been contended that if they are advised to bifurcate and remove the common area electricity for Ragamrit, in such a case, the CAE would be added to their common area maintenance dues which currently stands at Rs. 29,05,425.
- iv. It was categorically confirmed that Rs. 10,16,381 towards outstanding electricity dues were not been deposited with FPL AOA. The transaction took place between the two parties and FPL AOA was not informed of the same. Further, it was stated that an NOC is required from them in case of any sale or purchase, which was not undertaken in this transaction. The outstanding CAM dues stands at Rs. 29,05,425.
- v. It was stated that incidents of violence have occurred a couple of times. Police refuse to entertain the resident's plea for reasons best known to the police. In one

case, a victim went to the courts to have appropriate directions to the police. It has been informed that they have photos of a retired Air Force Commodore seen bleeding profusely from a head injury.

6. The Commission has carefully considered all the facts and circumstances of this case. At the outset, the Commission would like to delineate its jurisdiction. It has been established that this matter pertains to a dispute between two private parties i.e., Sh. Mandeep Singh and Ms. Savitri Devi. The same issue is also under consideration before the Commission in Complaint No. 208/Home/2025 under the notified service – Disposal of Online Complaint, in which detailed orders were passed on 10.12.2025 and conveyed vide letter no. 5208 dated 11.12.2025 (copy attached). Therefore, the present order is restricted to the billing aspect of the complaint. The complainant has shared the sale deed relevant to the said case, wherein it was explicitly mentioned that amounts of Rs. 2,80,744, Rs. 2,56,380 and Rs. 10,16,381 were duly paid by the complainant to the seller i.e., Savitri Devi, towards maintenance charges. These amounts cumulatively formed part of the sale consideration of Rs. 3.9 crores. At the outset, it has been clearly established that the bill raised by the RWA was incorrect, which has been duly admitted by DHBVN, as Common Area Charges, DG Charges and Maintenance Charges were applied in a questionable manner. Additionally, MMC was charged at a rate higher than the applicable tariff. Therefore, it is evident that the complainant was unduly charged these amounts despite the fact that little to no consumption was recorded during the contested period. However, payment with regard to the same was made in order to process the sale of the flat.
7. During the course of the investigation, it was also learnt from the submissions made by FPL AOA that the single-point electricity connection has been released in its name and it makes payment to the Nigam on behalf of all residents by raising bills for all nine towers in the complex, even though three towers i.e., J, G and H (constituents of BPTP Park Life RWA), form part of the FPL Complex. It was stated during the hearing by the representatives of FPL AOA that they have been incurring losses due to poor recoveries. Thereafter, it was established and placed on record that the contested amount of approximately Rs. 10 lakhs was not received by FPL AOA from Smt. Savitri Devi, even though the same was charged from the complainant as part of the private sale transaction. This prima facie amounts to a clear case of cheating under Section 318 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023. As the legal entity responsible for making payment to the Nigam, FPL AOA remains liable to pay the outstanding amount on account of consumption. The RWA cannot default in its contractual obligations towards the Nigam merely on account of non-recovery from an individual resident, as the dues are mandatorily payable. In the event of non-payment, the Nigam is well within its rights to take appropriate action as per the applicable statutory provisions. It was also established in the other complaint pending before the Commission that a settlement has been arrived at between the buyer and the complainant. However, such settlement does not absolve the RWA of its liability towards the Nigam. Therefore, the Commission can only advise the FPL AOA Management that it is well within its rights to lodge a formal FIR against Smt. Savitri Devi for recovery of the said amount.

8. As far as the remaining issues of the billing complaint and single point connection are concerned, the Commission has already taken up the matter of billing of RWAs through the Unified Billing Software (UBS) of the Nigam with the management of UHBVN and DHBVN. During the hearing, FPL AOA also offered to switch to the said platform and sought guidance from the Nigam with respect to billing of the residents. This would help eliminate such dubious practices and bring transparency in the raising and recording of bill payments. Though the Commission cannot get into the private nature of the dispute in the ibid case but it is well within its rights to ensure that inconsistencies with regard to raising of bills are resolved. Accordingly, the SDO (OP) is requested to provide all possible assistance to the RWA.

Copy of these orders are also shared with SHO, Sector 56, Gurugram for information and necessary action.

With these orders, this complaint is hereby disposed of.

25<sup>th</sup> February, 2026

