

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

No. F. 11(641)/DERC/2010-11/6073

Petition No. 84/2010

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

In the matter of:

Vinita
D/o Shri B N Bhanot
E-8, Maurice Nagar
University of Delhi
Delhi

...Petitioner

Versus

M/s Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.
Through its : CEO
Grid Sub-Station Building
Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp,
Delhi-110009

...Respondent

Coram:

**Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chairman, Sh. Shyam Wadhera, Member &
Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.**

Appearance:

1. Shri B P Agarwal, Counsel for the Petitioner.
2. Sh. Manish Srivastav, Counsel for the Respondent (TPDDL)
3. Sh. O P Singh, Sr. Manager, TPDDL
4. Sh. Shailender, Sr. Manager, TPDDL

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 07.02.2013)

(Date of Order: 18.02.2013)

1. The above matter was listed for hearing today in the Commission for filing of counter reply/rejoinder to the reply submitted by the Respondent on the last date of hearing.
2. The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner did not file any counter reply/rejoinder. However, he pointed out that while booking a false DAE case against him on 12.07.2012, procedure laid down under DERC Supply Code, 2007 has not been duly followed and has submitted that following violations have been committed by the Respondent.

- a) That the respondent has not sent the meter to NABL accredited laboratory for testing before making the allegation.
 - b) That the respondent has not taken any photograph of the meter nor made any videography, which is as per clause 52 (viii) of Supply Code, 2007 is essential for making a DAE case.
 - c) That the connected load was found to be 8.56 KW against sanctioned load of 8 KW whereas the sanctioned load is 3 KW and the MDI of the complainant was shown as 2.64 in the bill issued for the month of April 2010 which shows the allegation is totally baseless.
 - d) That the respondent has not downloaded the data from the meter despite an electronic meter installed at the house of the complainant.
3. During the course of arguments, the Commission raised following queries from the Respondent.
- (i) Whether there is or was any change in the consumption pattern after replacement of new electricity meter?
 - (ii) Whether the Respondent has checked the accuracy of the meter.
 - (iii) What was the consumption pattern six month prior to first inspection and subsequent to second inspection till date.
4. The Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent submitted that he require some more time to file their reply on the above issues.
5. After hearing both the parties, the Commission directed the Respondent to file the reply on the above issue within two weeks from the date of receipt of this order.
6. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.

Sd/-
(J. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-
(Shyam Wadhera)
Member

Sd/-
(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairman