

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

**Case No. 87/03/2006**

**In the matter of :**

Smt. Jag Roshni Devi  
M/s Goel Consultancy  
21/2, Hari Om Gali,  
Main Babarpur Road,  
Shahdara, Delhi-110032.

.....**Complainant**

**VERSUS**

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

.....**Respondent**

**Coram :**

**Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman & Sh. R. Krishnamoorthy, Member.**

**Appearance :**

1. Sh. S.K. Goel, Complainant.
2. Sh. Hemant Gupta, Advocate on behalf of the Respondent.
3. Sh. S.R. Dev, BM, BYPL.
4. Sh. S.L. Khullar, CO, BYPL.

**ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 10.10.2006)  
(Date of Order : 16.10.2006 )

1. This complaint was forwarded to the Commission by the CGRF, recommending imposition of penalty against the Respondent for violating the provisions of Regulation 42 of the DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.

2. The brief facts of the complaint are that the Complainant had approached the CGRF on 7.3.2006 by filing a complaint against the Respondent on the ground that the then DVB raised a bill amounting to Rs.3514.75 on the basis of reading from 16.5.2000 to 13.7.2001, in respect of electric connection No. 0050239158 (domestic purpose) with sanctioned load of 6 KW.

3. The Respondent continued to raise the provisional bills upto January 2003. The Complainant made all payments against the said bills. The respondent again started raising bills on average basis from the month of March 2003 to May 2005, when a bill for Rs.30936.14 was received on average basis.

4. The Respondent in its reply before the CGRF submitted that the provisional bills were raised due to non-feeding of the meter changing particulars in the computer.
5. The CGRF vide its order dated 6.6.2006 passed the following directions :-
  - a) The Respondent was directed to issue revised bills within 3 weeks from May 2004 onwards without any LPSC on actual consumption with proper slab.
  - b) The CGRF recommended this case to the Commission for imposition of appropriate penalty in terms of Regulation 42 of the DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.
6. Sh. Hemant Gupta, Counsel for the Respondent submitted before the Commission that the bills could not be issued on the basis of actual reading due to the non feeding of meter changing particulars in the computer. Sh. Hemant Gupta, Counsel also tendered unconditional apology and submitted that the issuance of provisional bills was neither intentional nor deliberate.
7. The Complainant was also present before the Commission. Sh. Hemant Gupta, Counsel handed over the copy of revised electricity bill to the Complainant during the hearing itself. The Complainant submitted that he is satisfied with the revised bill and requested the Commission not to press his complaint.
8. The Commission has observed that the Respondent kept on raising provisional bills for a very long period in violation of Regulation 18(iii) of DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.
9. In view of the above, the Respondent is directed to avoid raising the provisional bills beyond the period stipulated in the Regulations of DERC and take immediate steps to raise bills promptly on the basis of actual readings.
10. Considering all aspects of the matter carefully, the Commission decides not to impose any penalty in the present case but directs the Respondent to be more vigilant and take effective remedial measures so that such incidents are not repeated in future.
11. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(R. Krishnamoorthy)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Berjinder Singh)  
CHAIRMAN

