# Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

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

F.11(581)/DERC/2010-11/C.F.No. 2520/5065

**Petition No. 54/2010**

**In the matter of:** Complaint under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

AND

**In the matter of** :

Mohd. Taqi
2812, G/F, Gali Garihaya,
Kucha Chellan,
Delhi. **…Complainant**

VERSUS

BSESYamuna Power Limited
Through its : CEO
Shakti Kiran Bulding,
Karkardooma,
Delhi . **....Respondent**

**Coram:**
**Sh. P.D.Sudhakar, Chairman, Sh. Shyam Wadhera, Member &**
**Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.**

**Appearance:**

1. Pawan Kr. Mahur, Officer Legal, BYPL.

Date of Hearing : 15.11.2011
(Date of Order: 23.11.2011)

1. Complainant has filed this complaint under section 142 stating that demand raised by the Respondent for Rs. 20,827/- may be quashed.
2. The premises of the complainant was inspected on 14.01.2010, where connected load was found 4.827 KW against 0.25 KW domestic connection and meter date and time was found disturbed.
3. So, the Respondent booked a case of DAE and issued a show cause notice on dated 10.02.2010 along with the above bill.

4. In the said complaint, the complainant has raised the issue that the Respondent has not followed the provisions of Regulation 52 and other related Regulations of supply code while booking of the above case, therefore, the Respondent may be asked to withdraw the above case and action may be taken under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003. He has also cited the judgement of Ranbir Kaushik Vs. BRPL Writ Petition No. 9025/2008 filed in High Court.

5. However, in addition to its para wise reply filed in the Commission on 13.01.2011, the Respondent has also filed an affidavit on Oath stating there in that the aforesaid matter has already been amicably settled between petitioner and respondent company in August, 2010 and the complainant has paid full payment as per settlement and no dispute remains in between both parties.

6. In pursuance of the above, affidavit, Commission issued a letter to the complainant seeking confirmation from him on the above settlement as stated by Respondent and gave 15 days time to reply from the receipt of letter. This letter was issued on 07.10.2011 but no response has been received from the complainant.

7. The complainant was also informed through the letter that in absence of his reply, it will be presumed that he is no more interested to press his prayer /grievance and the said complaint shall be treated as amicably settled and withdrawn.

8. The Commission listed the matter for hearing today on 15.11.2011, which was attended by the representative of the Licensee i.e. Respondent whereas, no body appeared on behalf of the Complainant.

9. Since, the complainant has not responded to the above letter and also not attended the hearing, therefore, in light of the above, it is decided

that the present application is considered as amicably settled and withdrawn and hence it is disposed off.

10. Ordered accordingly.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sd/- | Sd/- | Sd/- |
| (J. P. Singh) | (Shyam Wadhera) | (P. D. Sudhakar) |
| MEMBER | MEMBER | CHAIRPERSON |