

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi –110 017

No. F. 11(385)(1)/DERC/2007-08/C.F.No. 3145

Petition No. 58/2007

In the matter of: Complaint under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

And

In the matter of:

A.R. Rajesh Babu
A-31, Amirtapuri,
Ranhola , Nilothi Road,
Nangloi,
New Delhi – 110 041

...Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Limited
Through its : CEO
BSES Bhawan,
Nehru Place,
Delhi-110 019

...Respondent

Coram:

**Sh. P.D. Sudhakar, Chairperson, Sh. Shyam Wadhera, Member &
Sh. J.P. Singh, Member**

ORDER

(Date of Order: 20.10.2011)

1. The present complaint has been filed by Sh. A.R. Rajesh Babu, R/o. H.No. A-31 Amirtapuri, Ranhola , Nilothi Road, Nangloi New Delhi – 110041, who is a registered consumer of the Respondent having K.No. 2630J7530025.
2. He has filed the above complaint against BRPL under section 142 of Electricity Act 2003, for violation of Regulation 11 of DERC (Guidelines for Establishment of Forum for Redressal of Grievances of the Consumers) Guidelines, 2003 by not implementing the order of the Ombudsman No. OMBUDSMAN/2007/123 (Amended) dated 24.01.2007/02.02.2007.

3. The facts of the case is that the above consumer filed a complaint before CGRF against the demand of Rs. 41,549/- made by the Respondent.
4. The said complaint was decided by the CGRF vide order dated 04.08.2006 directing therein that the present complainant is liable to pay an amount of Rs. 24,653.27/-.
5. Aggrieved by the above order of CGRF, the complainant filed an appeal before the Electricity Ombudsman, who vide its order dated 24.01.2007 directed that the bill for the period from November 2005 to 15.05.2006 may be raised on the basis of the average consumption of the next 6 months i.e. from May 2006 to November 2006. It was further directed that the new connection in the name of complainant be treated from the date of installation of the meter.
6. Further being aggrieved by the judgment dated 24.01.2008 passed by the office of Electricity Ombudsman, Respondent filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court in February 2007 for getting the said Order quashed / set aside.
7. The Respondent vide its letter dated 05.08.2011 has informed that they have complied with the order of the Ombudsman in the subject matter and consumer has also made the payment and requested for treating the above complaint as resolved.
8. They have also informed that in pursuance of the above, the pending Writ Petition No. 2613/2007 filed by them in the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, has also been withdrawn .
9. So in light of the above narration of facts, the Commission is of the view that since the Respondent has complied with the order of the Ombudsman and the complainant has also agreed to that by depositing the balance payment, the alleged violation of Regulation does not exist and hence, the instant complaint is disposed off as settled.
10. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shyam Wadhera)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
CHAIRPERSON