



C A No. Applied For  
Complaint No. 83/2021

In the matter of:

Mohd Asif

.....Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

.....Respondent

Quorum:

1. Mr. Arun P Singh (Chairman)
2. Mrs. Vinay Singh, Member (LAW)
3. Dr. Harshali Singh, Member (CRM)

Appearance:

1. Mr. S.B. Pandey, Counsel of the complainant
2. Mr. Imran Siddqi and Ms. Shweta Chaudhary, On behalf of BYPL

ORDER

Date of Hearing: 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2021  
Date of Order: 31<sup>st</sup> August, 2021

Order Pronounced By:- Dr.Harshali Singh, Member (CRM)

Briefly stated facts of the case are that the complainant applied for new electricity connection but the respondent has not released the same till date.

It is also his submission that he applied for new electricity connection vide application no. 8004900944 & 8004900949 on dated 07.04.2021 but the respondent company rejected his application for new connection on the pretext of "premises is under "RIGHT OF WAY" of HT Line.

*Imran Siddqi* *Shweta Chaudhary*

*Harshali Singh*

Complaint No. 83/2021

Therefore, <sup>4</sup>she requested the forum to direct the respondent for immediate release of the new connection.

Notices were issued to both the parties to appear before the Forum on 27.08.2021.

The respondent in their reply stated that the complainant applied for new electricity connection at the premises H.No. A-339, GF, Kh. No. 185/187/110/111, Gali No. 8, Shri Ram Colony, Rajeev Nagar, Delhi-110094 one for domestic purpose and other for commercial purpose vide request no. 8004900944 & 8004900949 dated 07.04.2021.

On inspection it was found that the premises in issue is under HT Line, a deficiency letter was issued to the complainant on 22.04.2021 duly intimating the complainant that "Premises is under HT Line, right of way of H.T. Line" (Horizontal distance from HT line conductor is 0 meters).

It was also their submission that Dy. Secretary (Dept. of Power) vide its letter dated 18.01.2017 has clarified that DISCOMS cannot provide electricity connections under HT lines as, as per CEA Regulations 2010, there is a right of way for the HT lines under various voltage level. Accordingly, since the issuance of the said letter the DISCOMS are not issuing electricity connection under HT lines. It was also mentioned that HT lines pertains to DTL and only DTL can ascertain the clearance of the connection as per CEA Regulations.

The complainant thereafter approached respondent office and insisted that he be provided electricity connections as others were also provided electricity connection inspite of the fact that their premises were under HT line. It was also mentioned by respondent that HT lines pertains to DTL and only DTL can ascertain the clearance of the connection.



Complaint No. 83/2021

Respondent along with their reply also submitted site inspection report submitting therein

1. Height of the building is approximately 3.80 meters,
2. Approx horizontal distance from nearest conductor is 0 meter
3. Approx vertical distance from roof of the premises is  $19.93 - 3.80 = 16.13$  meter.

Respondent further added that it is a 220 KV line.

The matter was heard on 27.08.2021, when counsel for the complainant was present in person. Respondent filed their reply and raised objection that the premises is under HT line. Arguments were heard and matter was reserved for orders.

We have gone through the submissions made by both the parties and heard their arguments. From the narration of facts and material placed before us we find that the premises where the electricity connection has been requested by the complainant is in the right of way, width of 220 KV (EHV) Transmission line of DTL as submitted by the respondent and on this ground itself the respondent rejected the request quoting the letter no. F-11(17)/2014/Power/91 dated 18.01.17 from Govt. of NCT (Department of Power), New Delhi. The relevant portion is as under:-

*"Connection under high tension lines: As per CEA Regulations 2010 there is a right of way for the HT lines under various voltage levels. No construction is allowed under these HT lines as per the right of way specified in the said CEA Regulation."*

As per classification of the voltages by CEA-the 220KV voltage is classified under Extra High Voltage (EHV) and the building is not under the line as per explanation given at Schedule X for Rule 61 of CEA Safety Regulations. Also in the agenda point no. 4 for the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of CEA standing committee on electrical safety, in January 2019, states as under:-



Complaint No. 83/2021

*"In this regard, it may be stated that CEA Electrical Safety Regulations, 2010, with its present amendments does not cover/indicate the ROW requirements for transmission lines. Neither has it showed any relation of ROW with the electric safety clearance specified in Regulation 58, 60 and 61 of CEA Electrical Safety Regulations, 2010. Due to this, problem is being faced by the Transmission/Distribution licensees in prohibiting people from construction of permanent structures below or close to the EHV or HV electric corridors."*

There is no provision in the Act, CEA Regulations and DERC Regulations, which prohibits release of electricity connection in houses and permanent structures near or close to EHV line if electrical safety clearances as specified in Regulations 58, 60 and 61 of CEA electrical safety regulations 2010 are available for that particular construction. Regulations 61 of CEA 2010, is as under:-

61 Clearances from buildings of lines of voltage exceeding 650V : (1) An overhead line shall not cross over an existing building as far as possible and no building shall be constructed under an existing overhead line.

(2) Where an overhead line of voltage exceeding 650 V passes above or adjacent to any building or part of the building it shall have on the basis of maximum sag a vertical clearance above the highest part of the building immediately under such line, of not less than:-

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| (i) For lines of voltages exceeding 650 Volts<br>Upto and including 33,000 volts | 3.7 meters  |
| (ii) For lines of voltages exceeding 33 KV                                       | 3.7 meters plus<br>0.30 meter for ever<br>additional 33,000 volts or<br>part thereof. |

(3) The horizontal clearance between the nearest conductor and any part of such building shall, on the basis of maximum deflection due to wind pressure be not less than:-



4 of 5 

Complaint NO. 83/2021

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (i) For lines of voltages exceeding 650 Volts<br>Upto and including 11,000 volts   | 1.2 meters   |
| (ii) For lines of voltages exceeding 11, 000 V<br>And upto and including 33, 000 V | 2.0 meters   |
| (iii) for lines of voltages exceeding 33 KV<br>for                                 | 2.0 meters plus 0.3 meter<br>every additional 33,000 volts<br>or part thereof. |

The, under the line condition and line passing adjacent to the building sketch has also been shown on schedule X for the Rule 61 of CEA Regulations, which indicates that if any portion of a building/construction lies between the vertical space between the spread width of the outermost conductors (along with swings due to wind pressure), then the Building/construction is said to be under the line. In the present case the building/construction is not under the line and the line is not passing/adjacent to the building, as per details submitted by the respondent.

The details submitted by the respondent are as under:-

- i) Height of the conductor from ground 19.93 meters approx
- ii) Height of the building- 3.80 meters approx
- iii) Horizontal distance between line and building- 0 meters (the line is neither adjacent to the building nor the building is under the line as per diagram of Schedule XA for Rule 61, CEA Safety Regulations).

Since in the present case the premises where the electricity connection has been applied is under the line. So, in view of the electrical safety concerns the application of complainant is rejected.

The case is dismissed as above.

No order as to the cost. Both the parties should be informed accordingly.  
Proceedings closed.

  
(HARSHALI KAUR)  
MEMBER (CRM)

  
(VINAY SINGH)  
MEMBER (LAW)

  
(ARUN P SINGH)  
CHAIRMAN