

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission
Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017

No. F. 11(636)/DERC/2010-11/2658/5340

Petition No. 26/2010

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

In the matter of:

N K Sharma
H No.396, SFS, Phase-IV
Ashok Vihar
Delhi – 110052

...Petitioner

Versus

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

...Respondent

Coram:

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

Appearance:

1. Petitioner in person.
2. Sh. O. P. Singh, Sr. Manager, TPDDL
3. Sh. Shailender Singh, Sr. Manager, TPDDL.
4. Ms. Sarika Mehta, AM, TPDDL.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 09.05.2013)
(Date of Order: 10.05.2013)

The matter was listed for hearing today in the Commission.

2. In compliance of the Order dated 11.04.2013 passed by the Commission, the Engineering Division filed its comments/inputs to the following queries.

- i. The details of calculation made for determining energy consumption in past 12 months following LDHF formula envisaged in Schedule III.
- ii. What was the basis of calculation of connected load of 7 KW.

- iii. Whether the consumption pattern was taken into consideration while deciding theft (showing month-wise consumption of past 12 months).
 - iv. How and why speaking order was passed without mentioning the calculation of load specifically bifurcating winter load & summer load respectively.
 - v. How sanctioned load changed from 2 KW in the first bill to 5 KW in the second bill against the inspection/case booked on 26.04.2010.
3. The Commission perused the comments/inputs submitted by the Engineering division.
4. During the course of hearing, the complainant submitted that since the meter was placed in the open area then he cannot be held responsible for tampering of the meter. The complainant also submitted that the said meter is still hanging in the open area and the same has neither been lifted nor sent to NABL certified Laboratory for testing which can prove any case of suspected theft. The complainant further requested that the Respondent may be directed to send the aforesaid meter to NABL certified Laboratory for meter testing.
5. On the above, the Sr. Manager of Respondent submitted that there are only two NABL accredited Laboratories which have been empanelled by the Commission for meter testing and the same are not accepting the meters for testing due to overburden of work. However, he is ready to send the meter to their own laboratory for meter testing, if Commission directed.
6. After hearing both the parties, the Commission directed the Respondent to visit the premises of the Petitioner on 10.05.2013 and seal the aforesaid meter strictly as per procedure laid down under Regulation 52 (viii) of DERC Supply Code, 2007. As far as testing of the seized meter is concerned, the Commission stated that the laboratory for testing of the meter would be specified by the Commission and intimated shortly to both the Complainant and the Respondent.
7. 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)
Chairperson