

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 17

No. F. 11(389)/DERC/2007-08

Petition No. 55/2008

In the matter of: Complaint under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for violation of the Provisions of Electricity Act read with Rules & Regulations framed by the Commission.

And

In the matter of:

Smt. Asha
Indian Gas Godown
Site No.1, Sector-15
Rohini, Delhi.

...Complainant

VERSUS

North Delhi Power Limited
Through its: CEO
Hudson Lines, Kindgsway Camp,
Delhi – 110009

...Respondent

Coram:

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

ORDER

(Date of Order: 17.08.2011)

1. The present complaint has been filed against NDPL by Smt. Asha, who is the registered consumer of the opposite party in respect of electricity connection bearing K.No. 46205096576 installed at Indian Gas Godown, Site No.1, Sector-15, Rohini, Delhi on 23.06.1999 for commercial purpose.
2. It has been alleged in the complaint that since the installation of the meter by the respondent company, it did not send any electricity bill up to February, 2006 and also never recorded reading of the meter in the last seven years. This act of the licensee is alleged to be in violation of Regulation 18(1) of the DERC Performance Standards – Metering and Billings Regulation 2002, which says that the meter shall be read once in every billing cycle. It further submitted that, it was on February, 2006 when the respondent licensee after taking reading of 25557 raised a bill of Rs. 126860/-. This action was challenged by the complainant. It has alleged that in spite of correcting the above bill the licensee booked a case of theft DAE after carrying out an inspection on 29.08.2006, in which connected load was found 0.1kW instead

of 1 kW and reading of the meter was found 6150 and seals of the meter were declared tampered.

3. The complainant has alleged that by framing DAE case provisions of Regulation 26 (II) and (III) of DERC Performance Standards – Metering and Billings Regulation 2002, were not followed.
4. The Commission taking cognizance on the above complaint issued notices to the respondent on dated 16.10.2007, 11.11.2008, 28.04.2009 asking respondent to file reply in the above matter.
5. The Respondent filed its reply on 29.10.2007, wherein it challenged the jurisdiction of the Commission in the above matter.
6. On 07.11.2010 the respondent informed that the above case has now been settled by its enforcement settlement committee, which has been agreed to by the complainant, who has also agreed to deposit the settled amount.
7. The Commission vide its letters dated 11.11.2008, 28.04.2009, 29.09.2009, 07.04.2011 wanted to seek confirmation from the consumer/ complainant about the above agreement / amicable settlement but failed to get any response from the complainant.
8. Ultimately the Commission decided to seek a confirmation from both the parties on affidavit enclosing therein the attested copies of the documentary evidence which can establish the statement of the Respondent.
9. The Commission has received an affidavit from the Respondent along with the copy of the settlement duly signed by both parties on 09.08.2011 which has been taken on record.
10. In view of the amicable settlement of the dispute between the parties, and by the act of not pressing the case by the complainant, no cause of action in the present complaint remains and hence, the above complaint is dismissed as settled.
11. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shyam Wadhera)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
CHAIRMAN