Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi - 17

Petition No. 19/2008

In the matter of:

Gian Chand Taneja, Plot No. 453, Main Road Jheel, Jheel Kuranja, Delhi – 110 051.

...Complainant

VERSUS

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

...Respondent

Coram:

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

Appearance:

- 1. Sh. M. L. Manocha, Advocate for the Complainant;
- 2. Sh. Akash Supakar, DGM, BYPL;
- 3. Sh. Rajeev Ranjan, Assistant Manager, Legal, BYPL.

<u>ORDER</u>

(Date of Hearing: 28.11.2008) (Date of Order: 16.12.2008)

- The present complaint was received from Sh. G. C. Taneja who was a registered consumer of electricity connection K. No. 1220 0B08 0010 for non-domestic purpose, with sanctioned load of 14.92 kW. The Complainant submitted that in the month of December, 2006, the Respondent raised a demand of Rs. 2,771.25 reflecting the consumption of 385 units. The Complainant paid the said amount along with a previous demand of Rs. 3,510/- as reflected in the bill.
- 2. He further submitted that on 21.12.2006, the Respondent replaced the existing meter. The Complainant being a senior citizen, aged 80 years, could not stop the Respondent from replacing the meter. In the month of February, 2007 he received a bill for Rs. 7,680/- showing the consumption of 1712 units. He deposited the exorbitant demand raised by the Respondent but, lodged a written complaint with the Respondent

regarding the defective/fast meter on 26.06.2007 and also deposited a sum of Rs. 113/- as meter testing charges. The officials of the Respondent visited the premises of the Complainant on 04.07.2007 for the purpose of testing the meter. The officials of the Respondent without proper testing simply told him that the meter was working properly. The Complainant, in the present complaint, has mainly alleged the excess billing due to defective meter.

3. The Respondent in its reply has submitted that the old electro-mechanical meter no. 9112905 was replaced on final reading of 61625 with a new electronic meter no. 17044336 at reading 1 on 21.12.2006 as a routine change. The Respondent has also provided the following details of readings and their break-up:

| Reading as on 28.11.2006 | 61365 |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Reading as on 21.12.2006 | 61625 |
| | 260 |
| | |
| New Meter | |
| Reading as on 21.12.2006 | 01 |
| Reading as on 30.01.2007 | 1453 |
| | 1452 |

- 4. The Respondent has submitted that the bill was charged from November, 2006 to January, 2007 on the basis of the aforesaid readings. It has been further submitted that the meter was duly tested on 03.07.2007 and as per the meter testing report an error of -0.08% was found which was within permissible limits, hence, the meter was not defective. Before the test, reading was 10117 and after the test, reading was 10118 and the test revolution found 800. Therefore, the meter was in order. As per the Respondent, the meter records the consumption as per the usage of electricity and, therefore, the bills raised by the Respondent are as per the actual meter readings.
- 5. The present dispute *prima faci*e appears to be of metering and billing. However, a letter has been received form Sh. Neeraj Taneja, S/o. Sh. Gian Chand Taneja, wherein, it has been informed that the Complainant had expired on 04.06.2008. Sh. M. L. Manocha, Advocate, has appeared for the Complainant.

- 6. Sh. Rajeev Ranjan, Assistant Manager (Legal), BYPL, submitted that the Respondent Licensee is willing to look into the complaint and redress the grievances of the Complainant. As the Complainant had expired already, the Respondent would approach his son Sh. Neeraj Taneja who may be the user of the existing electricity connection, and would resolve the dispute.
- 7. In view of the submissions made by Sh. Rajeev Ranjan it is directed by the Commission that the Respondent would resolve the dispute and submit compliance report to the Commission within two weeks from the date of receipt of this Order.
- 8. The Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/(Shyam Wadhera) (K. Venugopal) (Berjinder Singh)
MEMBER MEMBER CHAIRMAN