

# **Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission**

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi –110 017

F.11(612)/DERC/2010-11/C.F.No. 2570/6210

## **Petition No. 46/2010**

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

AND

**In the matter of:**

Ram Kishore Verma  
116, G/F, Chander Vihar,  
Mandawali, Fazal Pur  
Delhi

**...Petitioner**

## ***VERSUS***

BSES Yamuna Power Limited  
Through its : **CEO**  
Shakti Kiran Building,  
Karkardooma,  
Delhi-110 092

**...Respondent**

## **Coram:**

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

## **Appearance:**

1. Sh. Sita Ram, DGM, BYPL;
2. Sh. Pawan Kr. Mahur, Officer (Legal), BYPL.

## **ORDER**

Date of Hearing: 31.01.2012  
(Date of Order: 08.02.2012)

1. The instant complaint has been filed by Sh. Ram Kishore Verma, R/o H.No. 116, G/F, Chander Vihar, Mandawali, Fazalpur, Delhi who is the registered consumer of Respondent having K.No. 1230O1391026 for domestic purpose with 1KW sanctioned load. Further, there is another non domestic connection of sanctioned load of 3 KW in the name of the petitioner at the said premises bearing no. 1230O1391685.

2. The brief matrix of the case is that on 29.02.2010, the premise of the consumer was checked. On 23.03.2010, the consumer received a show cause notice of DAE. The consumer was required to attend the personal hearing on 28.04.2010 but the consumer sought extra time, which was not granted. On 07.05.2010, the consumer received an ex-parte speaking order in the above case along with assessed bill of Rs. 1,69,193/-. The consumer is alleging that while booking above case, the provisions of Regulation 52 and 53 of Supply Code have not been adhered to and hence the Respondent is guilty of violation of above Regulations. Whereas, Respondent has stated that the meter was dismantled in the presence of the consumer and illegal resistance solders were found connected on the PCB. The average consumption of the consumer is 13% of the normative LDHF consumption.
3. However, in addition to above, the Respondent has also filed an affidavit on 29.09.2011 stating that during the pendency of this case in the Commission, the aforesaid matter had been amicably settled between petitioner and Respondent company in October, 2010 and the complainant has paid full payment as per settlement and no dispute remains in between both parties. In pursuance of the above, 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. The letter was issued on 07.10.2011. 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.
4. In response to the above, the petitioner through his counsel has filed an application for withdrawal of his above complaint. Since, the Respondent has requested for withdrawal of the above complaint stating to have

amicably settled, therefore, in view of the above, it has been decided to disposed off the above complaint as considered, amicably settled and withdrawn.

5. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(J.P. Singh)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Shyam Wadhera)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(P.D. Sudhakar)  
CHAIRPERSON