

## **Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**

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

F.11 (1218)/DERC/2015-16

### **Petition No. 27/2015**

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

**And**

**In the matter of:**

Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal

H. No. 16, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Block A,

Near Deepali Chowk Saraswati,

Pitampura, New Delhi 110034

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd.

Through its: **M.D**

Grid Sub – Station Building,

Hudson Lines, Kingsway Camp

New Delhi – 110009

.....**Respondent**

**Coram:**

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

### **Appearance:**

1. Shri B.P. Agarwal, Counsel for the Petitioner;
2. Shri. Ajay Aggarwal, on behalf of the Petitioner;
3. Sh. Manish Srivastava, Advocate for Respondent;
4. Sh. O P Singh, AGM, TPDDL;
5. Sh. Neeraj Singh, AM, TPDDL;
6. Ms. Nayantara Pande, Corp Legal, TPDDL.

### **INTERIM ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 16.07.2015)

(Date of Order: 27.07.2015)

1. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal has filed a petition on 13.03.2015 against the Respondent Company under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for violation of the procedure laid down in Regulations of the Delhi Electricity Regulatory Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007. Subsequently he submitted an amended petition on 15.04.2015.

2. The matter was listed for hearing in the Commission today, which was attended by the petitioner and Counsel/representatives of the Respondent. During the hearing, the Counsel for the petitioner submitted that no bill was served since March 2014 and all of a sudden supply was disconnected without any disconnection notice of 15 days as required under the regulations.
3. The Counsel for the Respondent contested the argument by saying that regular bills were raised to the Petitioner and when he failed to deposit the dues, the disconnection was made after serving the disconnection notice.
4. The Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the so called bills raised and annexed with the submissions of the Respondent are in different format than the format in which he has received the bills at the time of disconnection.
5. The Counsel for the Respondent submitted that he has not received the copy of the amended petition and may require two weeks time to file a reply after receipt of it.
6. The copy of amended petition was handed over to the Respondent and he was directed to file the reply within two weeks with a copy to be served to the Petitioner.
7. The next date of hearing to decide about the admission of the Petition shall be intimated to the parties in due course.
8. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(B. P. Singh)  
Member

Sd/-  
(J. P. Singh)  
Member

Sd/-  
(P. D. Sudhakar)  
Chairperson