Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

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

No. F. 11(808)/DERC/2012-13/3455/4724

Petition No. 20/2010

In the matter of: Petition under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003
`

In the matter of:

S K Maheshwari
17, F.I.E Patparganj Industrial Area
Opp. Hasanpur Depot
Delhi-110092

…Petitioner

Versus

M/s BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its : CEO
Shakti Kiran Building
Karkardooma
Delhi-110092 **…Respondent**

Coram:

Sh. P. D. Sudhakar, Chaiperson, Sh. Shyam Wadhera, Member &
Sh. J. P. Singh, Member.

Appearance:

1. None for the petitioner

   (An e-email has been received from the Petitioner stating that due to pre-occupation he is unable to appear today before the Commission and requested for adjournment).
2. Sh. Manish Srivastava, Counsel for the Respondent
3. Sh. P K Mahur, Legal Officer for the Respondent
4. Sh. Ajeet Kumar, for the Respondent.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 22.11.2012)
(Date of Order: 03.12.2012)

The matter was listed on 22.11.2012 in the Commission for filing of reply by the respondent on the application of petitioner filed under Section 340 Cr.P.C which was supplied to the respondent on the last date of hearing as also filing of clarification in respect of the electricity bills sent to the petitioner without mentioning of "no current time".

2. At the outset of hearing, the Commission enquired from the Respondent's Counsel about non filing of clarification on the under mentioned issues:

(i) Clarification in respect of electricity bills where no **"no-current time"** given.

(ii) Filing of reply to the application filed by the petitioner under Section 340 of Cr.P.C.

3. In reply to the 1st issue, the Counsel of the Respondent submitted that due to complexity of issue and involvement of multiple bills, they could not prepare a reply, for which he sought two weeks time to file the same.

4. As regard to 2nd issue, the Counsel challenged the jurisdiction of the Commission stating it to be not maintainable in the Commission.

5. After hearing the Respondent's Counsel, the Commission directed the Respondent to file a reply on the following within two weeks on the following:

(a) Reply to the clarification sought on 1st issue.

(b) Reply to the application filed by the complainant under Section 340 of Cr.P.C

5. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(J. P. Singh) Member	(Shyam Wadhera) Member	(P. D. Sudhakar) Chairperson