

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

No. F. 11(846)/DERC/2012-13/3643

Petition No. 41/2012

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

In the matter of:

Ajit A A Tirkey
RZ-326-A, Gali No.16, Phase-1
Durga Vihar,
Najafgarh
New Delhi-110043

...Petitioner

Versus

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

...Respondent

Coram:

Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chairperson & Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.

Appearance:

1. Petitioner in person.
2. Sh. Manish Srivastava, Advocate for the Respondent.
3. Sh. P.K. Gupta, Manager (Legal) of Respondent.
4. Sh. Youdhveer Singh, DGM (O&M) of Respondent.
5. Sh. Chiranji Lal, DGM (O&M) of Respondent.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 28.11.2013)

(Date of Order: 06.12.2013)

1. The Electricity Ombudsman in its order dated 18.07.2012, in appeal No. F. ELECT/Ombudsman/2012/471, titled Shri Ajit A A Tirkey vs. BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.; has held that the Respondent has failed to provide supply to a genuine consumer in time and referred the matter to DERC to take-up this matter for appropriate action under Section 43 (3) of the Electricity Act, 2003.

2. The Commission while admitting the above petition, vide its Interim Order dated 26.07.2013, directed the Respondent to show cause on the prima facie findings of violation of Regulation 64 of Delhi Electricity Supply Code & Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.
3. The Respondent filed its reply to the above Show Cause Notice on 24.09.2013.
4. The matter was listed for hearing in the Commission today, which was attended by the petitioner and Counsel/representatives of the Respondent. The Petitioner alleged that he was without electricity for 1 year & 4 months as the electricity supply was not restored from 07.07.2010 till 07.11.2011. The Counsel for the Respondent objected to the contention of the Petitioner and submitted that the electricity supply was restored within 6 days from the date of complaint and therefore, there was no disruption in supply of electricity as alleged by the Petitioner. Had it been so, the petitioner would not have paid the electricity bill for the period of so called disconnection. The Petitioner controverted stating that he continued to pay the bill of minimum charges so as to be a consumer of the Discom to get his grievance redressed by the CGRF.
5. The Commission directed the Respondent to provide copy of the electricity bills within two weeks from the issue of the order, for the aforesaid period of alleged disconnection so that it may be ascertained on the basis of consumption whether supply was actually disconnected or electricity was available for use by the petitioner.
6. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.
7. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-

(J. P. Singh)
Member

Sd/-

(P. D. Sudhakar)
Chairperson