

DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110 017

F.11 (1250)/DERC/2015-16

Petition No. 46/2015

In the matter of: Petition filed under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

And

In the matter of:

Harbhajan Singh,
73-A, Navyug Block,
Vishnu Garden,
New Delhi – 110018

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

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

.....**Respondent**

Coram:

Sh. Krishna Saini, Chairperson & Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Petitioner in person
2. Shri V.K. Goel, Advocate of the Petitioner;
3. Shri Hardeep Singh, along with the Petitioner;
4. Shri Sarabjeet singh, along with the Petitioner;
5. Shri Arav Kapoor, Advocate for Respondent.
6. Shri S. Bhattacharya, DGM Enforcement, BRPL;

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 19.05.2016)

(Date of Order: 09.06.2016)

1. The instant petition has been filed by Shri Harbhajan Singh, 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 today, which was attended by the Counsel/representatives of both the parties. Arguments and submissions from both the parties were made at length.
3. During the Hearing, the Counsel for the Petitioner reiterated its submissions made in the Petition and he maintained that there had been violations of not producing any proof of identity or visiting card by the concerned official of the Respondent and for not providing any report at site. No CD for videography was supplied to the complainant. It was further submitted that the respondent failed to file a case against the consumer in the special court of electricity within 2 days from the date of inspection. He submitted that the Respondent in its reply dated 06.08.2015 has submitted that an FIR was lodged in the concerned Police Station, however, in the reply to the Show Cause Notice it is intimated that a complaint was lodged in the Police Station on 22.08.2015. The Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that the supply of electricity of the Petitioner is lying disconnected and the Petitioner is suffering on account of non-restoration of supply.
4. The Counsel for the Respondent contested the argument of the Petitioner. However, he admitted the fact that the Police complaint has not been lodged against the complainant within two days.
5. On the issue of reconnection of the supply of electricity, the Counsel for the Respondent submitted that due to non-payment of dues the electric supply

was disconnected and if a part payment is made, the Respondent may consider re-connection of electricity.

6. Both the parties sought time for reaching an amicable solution of the issue.
7. Keeping in view the above, the Commission adjourned the matter.
8. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.
9. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(Krishna Saini)
Chairperson