

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

CG-30/02/2006

In the matter of:

B. K. Bedi
(K. No. 114043311059)
Mrs. Manpreet Kaur Kalra
38, Pusa Road, Ground Floor
New Delhi – 110 005.

...Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through: its **CEO**
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma,
Delhi-110092.

...Respondent

Coram:

Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman & Sh. K. Venugopal, Member

Appearance:

1. Sh. R. R. Duggal, Sr. BM (SRD);
2. Sh. P. C. Jain, Dy. FO (SRD);
3. Sh. H. Soni, AGM (Central), BYPL;
4. Sh. Hement Gupta, Advocate, BYPL;
5. Sh. Rajeev Ranjan, Asst. Manager.

ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 24.07.2007)

(Date of Order: 03.08.2007)

1. This complaint has been forwarded by the CGRF vide its Order dated 14.03.2006 for imposition of penalty upon the Respondent for raising the provisional bills.
2. The brief background of the case is that the Complainant had an electricity connection no. 814100267558A having a sanctioned load of 0.50 kw for DX category (Domestic). The old meter was changed on request of the Complainant on 22.11.2004 with 8756 reading which was recorded in the month of June, 2004. A bill of Rs. 50,691.22p was raised against the Complainant in December, 2005 on the basis of the assessment done for the period the meter remained defective. The Complainant challenged the said bill before the CGRF.

3. The Respondent pleaded before the CGRF that they are entitled to the assessment on the basis of the faulty meter for the period from June, 2004 (when the last reading was recorded i.e., 8756 units) to 22.11.2004 i.e. the date on which meter was replaced.
4. The CGRF observed that the exorbitant bill raised against the Complainant was a result of periodic provisional/average billing for the period from July, 2003 to January, 2004 and from January 2005 to October, 2005.
5. The CGRF while deciding the complaint, passed the following directions:
 - a) The Respondent was directed to revise the bill of the Complainant without any assessment for the period the meter remained faulty.
 - b) They were further directed not to levy any surcharge on the revised bill and also make adjustments to all the payments made by the Complainant.
 - c) Compensation of Rs. 2,000/- was granted to the Complainant. The order was to be complied with within 3 weeks from the date of the order failing which the Respondent would be liable to a further cost @ 18% per annum.
 - d) The CGRF also forwarded their order to the Commission for imposition of the appropriate penalty in terms of Regulation 42 of the DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.
6. The Respondent in their reply before this Commission have given a very short and unsatisfactory reply wherein it has been submitted that the provisional bills were issued due to non-punching of reading in the system and also due to change of meter on various occasions.
7. No one is present from the Complainant's side.

8. The Ld. Counsel Sh. Hement Gupta on behalf of the Respondent submitted that the provisional bills were issued due to non-punching of the readings in the system. He also apprised the Commission that the Order of the CGRF has already been implemented and also requested the Commission to take a lenient view in the matter.
9. We have heard the argument of Sh. Hement Gupta, the counsel for the Respondent, and have also gone through the record, as made available by the CGRF, and it is observed that the Respondent have raised provisional bills in violation of the DERC Regulations, causing certain amount of harassment to the Complainant.
10. In view of the above, the Commission decides to impose a token penalty of Rs. 1,000/- on the Licensee for its failure to comply with the Regulations. Further, the Licensee is directed to ensure that such instances are not repeated in future.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN