

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

Petition No. 59/2004

In the matter of:

Sh. Pradeep Jain,
IX/13, 2nd Floor, Main Road,
Kailash Nagar, Delhi-110093.

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

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

.....**Respondent**

Coram:

**Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman & Sh. K. Venugopal, Member &
Sh. R. Krishnamoorthy, Member.**

Appearance:

1. None for the Complainant.
2. Mr. Rajeev Ranjan, Sr. Officer (Legal), for BSES.

ORDER

(Date of hearing: 28.11.2006)
(Date of Order: 04.12.2006)

- 1) In the present complaint, the Complainant approached this Commission with the following main reliefs:
 - (i) To quash the demand raised by the Respondent for Rs. 4,57,940/- under direct theft;
 - (ii) To restrain the Respondent from lodging FIR against the Complainant.
- 2) In this Complaint it is alleged that the meter no. 1220R4090467 got burnt on 16.05.2004 and that the Petitioner approached the Respondent for its replacement on 17.05.2004 by lodging a formal complaint. His contention is that the Respondent had failed to replace the meter in terms of Regulation 20(iii)(a) of DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.
- 3) It has also been stated in the complaint that the electricity was restored by the representatives of the Respondent on 21.05.2004 but, without changing the meter, and on 27.05.2005 the Respondent booked a case of theft against the Complainant and raised a bill of Rs. 4,47,940/-.

- 4) The Complainant has further submitted that the officials of the Respondent revisited the premises for replacement of meter on 04.06.2004 and finally, the meter was removed from the premises of the Complainant on 18.06.2004 without his knowledge for which he even lodged a complaint at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, Delhi.
- 5) The Respondent in their reply have submitted that grievances of the Complainant stands redressed and direct theft case has been dropped. The Complainant is satisfied with the action taken by the Respondent and has also given a letter of satisfaction in support of their amicable settlement and willingness to withdraw the complaint submitted to the Hon'ble Commission.
- 6) The Respondent have also tendered an unconditional apology for not filing the reply in time and have undertaken to be more vigilant in future.
- 7) No one is present from the side of the Complainant.
- 8) The representative of the Respondent has also furnished the settlement agreement reached between the parties on 27.11.2006 reflecting therein that the parties have mutually agreed to settle the dispute.
- 9) In view of the amicable settlement between the parties the Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(R. Krishnamoorthy)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN