

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

**CG-198/05/06**

**In the matter of:**

Sh. Prem Dutt Pathak  
B-41, FF, Dilshad Colony  
Delhi – 110 095.

**...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**

**Appearance:**

1. Sh. Prem Dutt Pathak, Complainant;
2. Sh. Hement Gupta, Advocate, BYPL;
3. Sh. Sanjeev Seth, Addl. General Manager;
4. Sh. S. L. Khullar, AFO.

**ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 26.07.2007)  
(Date of Order: 06.08.2007)

1. This complaint has been forwarded by the CGRF vide its Order dated 31.07.2006 for imposition of penalty upon the Respondent for denying an electricity connection for almost 5 months without any justifiable reason.
2. The brief background of the case is that the Complainant approached the CGRF on 26.05.2006 on the ground that the Complainant applied for the electricity connection on 09.03.2006 which was not released in his favour. The Respondent in their reply submitted before the CGRF that there were dues pending against the electricity connection installed at the premises of the Complainant. The Respondent were ready to release the electricity connection subject to the payment of Rs. 5,236 as pro-rata amount against K. No. 121110910432.
3. The Respondent sorted out the matter during the pendency of the complaint before CGRF and reached at some mutual settlement with the

Complainant. They also undertook before the CGRF that they would immediately install the meter. They also appended a satisfaction letter of the Complainant alongwith a request for closure of the case before the CGRF.

4. The Ld. Forum while disposing of the complaint on 31.07.2006, recommended the present complaint to this Commission for imposition of appropriate penalty under Section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003 for denying an electricity connection for almost 5 months for no valid reason.
5. In response to the show-cause notice, the Respondent have submitted in their reply that there were dues pending against the electricity connection. The Complainant was asked to deposit an amount of Rs. 5,236/- as pro-rata amount against K. No. 121110910432.
6. Sh. Hement Gupta, Counsel for the Respondent, submitted that the dues were pending against the entire property. K.No. 121110910432 against which the dues were pending, was installed at the second floor. However, the Complainant was seeking the new connection at the first floor of the premises. The representative of the Respondent apprised their higher authorities about these facts, who in turn, agreed to withdraw the said dues against the Complainant. Subsequently, the demand charges were raised and paid by the Complainant. A new connection has now been installed at the first floor of the premises on 31.7.2006.
7. The Commission has observed that the electricity connection against which the dues were pending was installed at the second floor, whereas the Complainant was seeking electricity connection on the first floor of the building. Therefore, the Respondent has unnecessarily delayed the electricity connection in favour of the Complainant.
8. In view of the above, the Commission directs the Respondent to be more diligent in future in dealing with such cases and warns that failure to comply with the Regulations would invite strict action under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003.

Sd/-  
(K. Venugopal)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Berjinder Singh)  
CHAIRMAN