

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

No. F. 11(865)/DERC/2012-13/3713/

**Petition No. 47/2012**

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

**In the matter of:**

Ramesh Ahuja  
3-LSC, Kanishka Complex  
Saini Enclave  
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, Chairperson & Sh. J.P. Singh, Member.

**Appearance:**

1. Sh. Manish Srivastava, Advocate of Respondent;
2. Shri I U Siddiqui, Legal Officer, BYPL.

**ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 27.03.2014)

(Date of Order: 03.04.2014)

1. The instant petition has been jointly filed by following four petitioners through their power of attorney Shri Ramesh Ahuja for alleged failure of the Respondent to provide electric connection on their application as per section 43 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and provisions of DERC Supply Code, 2007:
  - a. Shri Om Prakash Manchanda
  - b. Shri Rakesh Rajput
  - c. Som Nath
  - d. Ms. Mamta Jain

2. The Commission has ordered "on the spot" enquiry to verify the claim of the Respondent that providing new connection at the site of petitioners requires augmentation of supply system, which was technically "not feasible". On the basis of the report of the enquiry, which indicated otherwise, the petition was admitted and a show cause notice was issued to the respondent on 31.10.2013.
3. The matter was listed for hearing today i.e. 27.03.2014. Meanwhile on 26.03.2014, the Commission received an email from the petitioner stating that the dispute has been settled amicably as the connections have been energized by way of augmentation of supply system. The petitioner also requested the Commission to treat the petition as withdrawn.
4. During the hearing today, no appearance was made by the petitioner or his counsel nor any communication for adjournment etc. was received from the petitioner. Whereas, the counsel of the respondent requested to dismiss the petition as withdrawn as per the request of the petitioner as the matter has been amicably settled between the parties.
5. Taking cognizance of the email by the petitioner to withdraw the complaint, the Commission dismissed the petition as withdrawn.
6. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(J. P. Singh)  
Member

Sd/-  
(P. D. Sudhakar)  
Chairperson