

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

CG-26/01/2006

Mohd. Khalil
M/s Goel Consultancy
21/2, Hari Om Gali,
Main Babarpur Road,
Shahdara, Delhi-110032.

.....**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. S.K. Goel, AR for Complainant.
2. Sh. Amit Prakash, BM (CCK)
3. Sh. Hement Gupta, Advocate on behalf of the Respondent.
4. 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 14.03.2006 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. Brief background of the case is that the complainant approached the CGRF on 30.01.2006 mainly on the ground that the Complainant had an electricity connection K. No. 111017750467 sanctioned for load of 2 kw (non-domestic purpose), the electricity connection was energized on 25.12.2003, whereas the first bill was issued to the Complainant in the month of August, 2005, that too, on provisional basis.

3. During the course of the proceedings, the CGRF observed that the Respondent failed to raise the bill in terms of the Regulations of the DERC as the first bill was raised by the Respondent after a period of about two years from the date of energisation of the connection which caused inconvenience to the Complainant.

4. On hearing the parties, the CGRF passed the following directions:
 - a) The Respondent were directed to pay a compensation of Rs. 2,000/- for undue harassment caused to the Complainant.
 - b) The LPSC amount was directed to be waived of.
 - c) The Complainant was allowed to make the payment of his bill in ten instalments.
 - d) Forwarded the case to the DERC for imposition of penalty for delay in raising the first bill.
5. The parties are present.
6. Sh. Hement Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent, submitted that the delay in raising the first bill has been caused because after unbundling of DVB on 30.06.2002, a large number of old employees of erstwhile DVB took mass voluntary retirement resulting in accumulation of work and further, the Respondent was undergoing a change in the organizational structure in order to streamline the customer handling procedure.
7. Sh. Hement Gupta, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent, apologised on behalf of the Respondent and submitted before the Commission 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.
8. In view of the submissions of the parties and on perusal of the records as made available by the CGRF, it is observed that the Respondent had raised the first bill after about 2 years. This fact has even been admitted by the Respondent in their reply.
9. The Commission, therefore, decides to impose a token penalty of Rs. 1000/- on the Licensee for its failure to comply with the Regulations. Further, The Licensee is directed to avoid repetition of such instances in future as the common man is put to a lot of inconvenience by such delays.
10. Ordered accordingly.

(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN