

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017

In the matter of:

Smt. Adesh Tyagi
1/2350, Ram Nagar
Shanti Building, Gali no. 4
Shahdara
New Delhi – 110 032.

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.,
Through its: **CEO**,
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi – 110 019.

.....**Respondent**

Coram:

**Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman, Sh. K. Venugopal, Member &
Sh. R. Krishnamoorthy, Member.**

Appearance:

1. Sh. S. K. Kansal, Business Manager (BRPL)

ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 03.05.2007)

(Date of Order: 10.05.2007)

1. The present complaint has been received from the Office of the Ombudsman recommending penalty upon the Respondent for violation of the Regulations of DERC.
2. The brief facts of the case are that Smt. Adesh Tyagi, the Complainant, filed a complaint before the CGRF on 18.01.2006, wherein she prayed for a direction to the Respondent to revise the wrong bill amounting to Rs. 25,404/- in December, 2003 for consumption of 9747 units. She submitted that her premises remained locked upto October, 2005 as she was living with her parents at Hapur, U.P.
3. The CGRF vide its Order dated 16.03.2006 directed the Respondent BRPL to send a team of enforcement officers to check whether there was any theft/DAE in this case.
4. The Complainant, aggrieved by the Order of CGRF, approached the Ombudsman in an appeal and submitted that since the meter had already stopped, there was no need for her to resort to theft of energy.

5. The Respondent Licensee in their reply before the Ombudsman admitted that the meter was lying stopped for the last four years approximately. They also admitted that the bill raised in December, 2003 was not in order as the meter was faulty ever since July, 2002 and new meter was replaced only on 13.04.2006.
6. The Ombudsman vide its Order dated 04.12.2006 quashed the bill raised by the Respondent Licensee in December, 2003 for an amount of Rs. 25,404/-. A penalty of Rs. 2,000/- was also imposed upon the Respondent for raising provisional bills in between October, 2005 and June, 2006. The Ombudsman also recommended imposition of penalty for putting the Complainant to a lot of harassment.
7. The Order of the Ombudsman dated 4.12.2006, refers to the contents of the appeal filed by the Complainant. In the said appeal it is stated that the Respondent Licensee is trying to intimidate the consumer by sending inspection teams repeatedly. However, as evident from the order of the Ombudsman, even after repeated visits/inspections of her premises, no theft/DAE was detected by the officials of the Respondent Licensee.
8. Although, the Ombudsman has imposed a penalty of Rs.2,000/- against the Respondent Licensee for raising provisional bills, but looking at the sequence of events and the manner in which the Complainant was harassed, the Commission takes a serious note of the acts of commission and omission on the part of the Respondent Licensee. This incident reveals a very sorry state of affairs, reflects total lack of sensitivity towards the problems of the consumers and a poor redressal mechanism to handle such complaints. This incident also reveals a serious lack of coordination between different departments of the Respondent Licensee. There is an urgent need for the Respondent Licensee to look into the whole incident and take some well meaning effective remedial measures so that such incidents are not repeated in future. There is a clear evidence to establish how the Regulations of DERC have been flouted.
9. In view of the gravity of the matter, the Commission direct the CEO of the Respondent Licensee to personally look into the incident and take suitable action against the erring officials so that the consumers like the Complainant are not put to harassment at their hands. The Commission also decides to award a token compensation of Rs. 10,000/- in favour of

the Complainant, to be paid by the Respondent Licensee within a period of 04 weeks from the date of receipt of this order and submit a compliance report to the Commission.

10. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(R. Krishnamoorthy)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN