

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

CG-136/04/2006

In the matter of :

Sh. Jitender Aggarwal
Part B/42, G.F., Jhilmil Ind. Area,
Delhi-110095.

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

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

.....**Respondent**

Coram :

Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman & Sh. K. Venugopal, Member .

Appearance :

1. Sh. Hement Gupta, Advocate on behalf of the Respondent.
2. Sh. Rajeev Ranjan, Asstt. Manager, BRPL

ORDER

(Date of Hearing : 24.07.2007)

(Date of Order : 02.08.2007)

1. This complaint has been forwarded by the CGRF vide its Order dated 03.07.2006 for imposition of penalty upon the Respondent for not raising the bill for about 2 years from the date of installation of the meter.

2. The brief back ground of the case is that the complainant approached the CGRF on 14.04.2006 on the ground that he was having a connection for industrial purpose with a sanctioned load of 79 kw. The electricity connection was initially energized on March, 2004 but the Respondent never raised any bill against the electricity connection till the month of March, 2006. The Complainant approached the office of the Respondent on various occasions, but of no avail. Subsequently, the Respondent raised the bill in the month of March, 2006 for an amount of Rs. 16,15,067/-.

3. The CGRF during the course of the proceedings observed that the Respondent failed to raise a bill for two years from the date of installation of the meter.

4. The CGRF forwarded the complaint to this Commission for imposition of penalty for not raising the bills at all for 2 years from the date of the installation of the meter.

5. None is present for the Complainant's side.

6. Sh. Hement Gupta, Counsel for the Respondent, submitted that the connection was released by the Respondent, but the bill was not generated. The delay in raising the bill was neither intentional nor deliberate. Sh. Hement Gupta, also tendered an apology on behalf of the Respondent and prayed that a lenient view may be taken in the present complaint. He also apprised the Commission that the order of the CGRF has already been implemented.

7. In view of the submissions of Sh. Gupta, and on perusal of the records as made available by the CGRF to the Commission, it is observed that the Respondent delayed in raising the first bill for 2 years. The same fact has even been admitted by the Respondent in their reply.

8. The Commission, therefore, decides to impose a token penalty of Rs. 5000/- on the Respondent Licensee for its failure to comply with the Regulations. Further, The Licensee is directed to avoid such instances in future as they put the common man to a lot of inconvenience.

9. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN