

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

CG/99/2005

M/s Royal Laces Ltd.
D-114, Okhla Industrial Area,
New Delhi-110020.

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its : **CEO**
BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place,
New Delhi-110019.

.....**Respondent**

Coram :

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

Appearance :

1. Sh. R.C. Mehta, AVP, BRPL
2. Sh. Sanjay Kumar, Manager (C), KCC, BSES

ORDER

(Date of Hearing : 16.01.2007)

(Date of Order : 13.02.2007)

1. The present complaint has been forwarded by the CGRF, recommending imposition of penalty upon the Respondent for delay in submitting the action taken report regarding implementation of the Order dated 15.7.2005 by the Licensee.

2. The brief background of the case is that the Complainant had an existing load of 94 KW under the LIP category. He sought an additional load of 59.20 kw making a total of 153.20 kw.

3. The Licensee demanded a sum of Rs.4,87,707/- for the reason that the existing 630 KVA transformer was to be augmented to 990 KVA capacity on the basis of the description given below :-

Description	Consumer's Share	Share of BSES	Total Cost
Transformer	Rs.1,87,314	Rs.4,90,406	Rs.6,77,720
LT fee (I/C RR charges)	Rs.3,10,393		Rs.3,10,393
Total	Rs.4,97,707	Rs.4,90,406	Rs.9,88,113

4. The CGRF issued an Order stating that the Forum desired the detailed commercial order indicating the method of charging the amount against the impugned augmentation of the existing transformer. In case such improvement/augmentation of the transformer had to be done, the same was to be done with the approval of the Commission. The Forum further observed that if the said amount of Rs.4,47,707/- was payable, then BRPL should have the approval of the Commission.

5. The Ld. Forum vide its Order dated 15.7.2005 directed the Respondent that a detailed commercial order indicating the method of charging in cases where necessity arises for augmentation of existing transformer to meet the requirement of load applied for by the parties within the limit of 200 KW on LT, be issued by BRPL with the approval of DERC to enable them to know before hand as to how much expenditure they would incur for augmentation of the Transformer for sanction of additional load at their premises. The Manager (Comm) was directed to ensure that norms on the subject were made available to the Complainant within a week of the issuance of the order.

6. The Secretary, CGRF vide his letter dated 8.9.2005 sought the 'action taken report' (ATR) on the Order dated 15.7.2005 from the Respondent in terms of Regulation 9(6) of DERC (Guidelines for establishment of Forum for Redressal of Grievance of the consumers and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2003 but, on not receiving the ATR, the matter has been referred to the Commission.

7. No one appeared for the Complainant's side. Sh. R.C. Mehta, Representative of the Respondent, submitted that the grievance of the Complainant has already been redressed and his electricity connection has been energised and commissioned in May 2006. The Complainant is now satisfied with the services being provided by the Respondent.

8. Sh. R.C. Mehta, could not give any plausible explanation as to why the Respondent did not submit the 'action taken report' before the CGRF within the stipulated period in terms of Regulation 9(6) of the DERC (Guidelines for establishment of Forum for redressal of grievances of the consumer and Ombudsman) Regulations, 2003. Moreover, in response to the show cause notice issued on 1.11.2006 by the Commission, the Respondent, instead of filing a proper reply on all relevant issues in accordance with DERC Comprehensive (Conduct of Business) Regulations, 2001, have simply sent a letter informing that the electricity connection at the premises of the Complainant has been commissioned and energised in May 2006 to the fullest satisfaction of the consumer who is paying his energy bill regularly since then.

9. In view of the above, the Commission decides to impose a penalty of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) against the Respondent for violation of Regulation 9(6) of the Regulations of 2003 mentioned above, with the direction to deposit the same within three weeks from the date of this Order. The Respondent Licensee are also advised to ensure that the orders or directions issued by the CGRF or those issued by this Commission are complied within the stipulated period in letter and spirit.

10. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(R. Krishnamoorthy)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN