Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

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

F.11 (1443)/DERC/2015-16/5573

Suo-Moto Petition No. 59/2016 u/\$ 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

In the Complaint of: Smt. Meena Rawat, A-2, First Floor, Old Double Storey, Nirmal Puri, Lajpat Nagar-IV, New Delhi – 110024

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

.....Licensee

Coram:

Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

- 1. Shri Devender Singh Rawat, on behalf of the Complainant;
- 2. Sh. Krishnendu Datta, Advocate, BRPL
- 3. Shri Aruj Mathur, Manager-Legal, BRPL.
- 4. Sh. S. Bhattacharya, GM Enforcement, BRPL
- 5. Shri Aditya Gupta, Advocate for Respondent;
- 6. Shri Shagun Trisal, Advocate for Respondent.

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 08.06.2017) (Date of Order: 12.06.2017)

 The instant case relates to Suo moto cognizance been taken by the Commission under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against the Licensee namely BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. for violation of the procedure laid down in the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.

Suo - Moto Petition No. 59/2016

2. The matter was heard on 08.06.2017, which was attended by the

Counsel/authorized representatives of Licensee. The Counsel for the Licensee

submitted that in compliance to the Order dated 03.05.2017 of the

Commission, a status report was filed before the Commission and the

employment of Mr. Jitendra Ghia, the errant officer of BRPL, who was earlier

working as Senior Manager with BRPL has come to an end and he is no more

associated with BRPL. It was further submitted by the Counsel that both the

parties to the complaint have resolved all their grouses and settled all their

respective claims and recorded the said settlement vide execution of

settlement of Agreement dated 05.06.2017. The Complainant also endorsed

the statement of the Licensee that the matter has been settled between the

parties, however, he has yet to receive the payment from the Licensee.

3. The Counsel for the Licensee requested the Commission that in view of the

action taken against the errant officer of BRPL and the settlement so arrived,

the matter be directed to be disposed of as satisfied and BRPL be relieved

from present proceedings.

4. The judgement is reserved.

5. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-

(B. P. Singh)

Member