

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

Petition No. 07/2005

In the matter of:

Sh. Manish Sachdeva,
S/o. Sh. Harish Sachdeva,
BB-334/3, TF, Amarpuri, Nabi karim,
New Delhi – 110 055.

...Complainant

Through: Shri V.K. Goel, Advocate,
Ch. No. 749, W.W. Tis Hazari, Delhi.

VERSUS

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

...Respondent

Petition No. 08/2005

In the matter of:

Sh. Kishore Lal,
S/o. Sh. Beni Ram,
BB-334/3, GF, Amarpuri, Nabi karim,
New Delhi – 110 055.

...Complainant

Through: Shri V.K. Goel, Advocate,
Ch. No. 749, W.W. Tis Hazari, Delhi.

VERSUS

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

...Respondent

Coram:

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

Appearance:

1. Sh. V.K. Goel, Advocate on behalf of the Complainant.
2. Sh. Vijay, Asst. to Sh. V. K. Goel.
3. Sh. Rajeev Ranjan. Asst. Manager

ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 26.07.2007)

(Date of Order: 10.08.2007)

1. The two Petitions filed by Sh. Manish Sachdeva and Sh. Kishore Lal are taken up together for hearing since the issues for consideration before the

Commission are similar in nature. The matter was listed for hearing earlier on 19th June, 2007 but no one appeared from either side on that day. The Commission then decided to grant one more opportunity to the parties and directed that the notices to be issued by the registered post with A.D. The notices were accordingly issued and both the cases were listed again for hearing. The complainants are not present even today. Sh. V. K. Goel, Counsel for the Petitioners expressed his inability to argue the case as he has no instructions from the Petitioners. He has also not requested for any adjournment in the matter. Moreover, a letter submitted by the Respondent under the signature of one Sh. Sunil Kumar, purported to be the landlord of the property in question, reveals that the Complainants were tenants in the said property and have vacated the premises already in 2005. This letter further reveals that the dispute regarding installation of a new connection stands settled after he deposited the requisite charges. Although there is nothing on record to show that Sunil Kumar is the owner of the property or that the Petitioners have already vacated the said premises, there is nothing to dispute these facts either. It appears that the Complainants are not interested to pursue this matter as they have not come forward inspite of having been given the opportunity twice.

2. In view of the above the Commission decides to dismiss both the Petitions as not pressed.
3. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN