DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

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

F.11 (1220)/DERC/2015-16

Petition No. 26/2015

Under section 142 of Electricity Act, 2003

In the matter of:

Ashok Kumar
H-58 T/F, NDSE I, Part I,
New Delhi - 110048 **…….Complainant**

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
BSES Bhawan
Nehru Place
New Delhi-110019 **……..Respondent**

Coram:
Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Shri Manoj Banka, Authorized Representative of the Petitioner;
2. Shri Manoj Kv, along with the Petitioner;
3. Shri Videsh Kr, along with the Petitioner;
4. Shri Krishnandu Datta, Advocate for Respondent;
5. Shri S. Bhattacharya, DGM Enforcement, BRPL.
6. Shri Aruj Mathur, Legal Manager, BRPL;
7. Shri Aditya Gupta, Advocate for Respondent;
8. Shri Shagun Trisal, Advocate for Respondent.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 16.03.2017)
(Date of Order: 23.03.2017)

1. The instant petition has been filed by Shri Ashok Kumar, under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. for violation of the procedure laid down in Regulations of the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.

2. The matter was listed for hearing in the Commission, which was attended by both the parties. During the hearing, the Authorized Representative of the Petitioner submitted that the Petitioner was regularly billed for the Meter No. 124556, whereas, the assessment had been done against the new Meter No. 22145869. It was further argued that the entire case is fabricated and is made against a Meter which was never installed in his premises and even in the Speaking Order, the Meter No. 22145869 is mentioned. The Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Meter No. 22145869 was installed, but was not punched for billing purpose.

3. The Commission asked the Respondent to clarify that when the above Meter was not punched, how assessment can be made against such Meter, and also to specify the exact date when the above Meter No. 22145869 was installed at the premises of the Petitioner. The Counsel for the Respondent sought one week's time to respond to the queries.

4. The Commission accepted the prayer of the Respondent and adjourned the hearing for a future date.

5. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.

6. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B. P. Singh)
Member