

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

CG.156/04/2005

In the matter of:

Sh. V. P. Gupta,
1/31, Old Rajinder Nagar,
New Delhi-110032.

.....Complainant

Through: Shri V. K. Goel, Advocate,
Ch. No. 749, W. W. Tis Hazari, Delhi.

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
Shakti Kiran Building,
Karkardooma,
Delhi-110092.

.....Respondent

Coram:

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

Appearance:

1. Mr. V. P. Gupta, Complainant
2. Mr. Hemant Gupta, Advocate on behalf of the Respondent
3. Mr. Naveen Kumar, Senior Officer (Legal), BYPL
4. Mr. P. C. Jain, AGM, BYPL
5. Mr. H. Soni, AGM BYPL
6. Mr. R. R. Duggal, BM, BYPL.

ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 28.09.2006)
(Date of Order: 17.10.2006)

- 1) This complaint was forwarded to the Commission by the CGRF, wherein, the CGRF recommended imposition of the penalty under Regulation 38, of the DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002, as well as under Section 43(3) of the Electricity Act, 2003.
- 2) The brief facts of the complaint are that the Complainant had applied for a connection on 22.01.2004. The connection was energized on 09.04.2005 i.e., over one year. In between the Complainant had filed a complaint with CGRF on 04.04.2005 and the CGRF had issued a notice to the Licensee on 08.04.2005.

- 3) The Commission heard the parties in detail.
- 4) Shri Hemant Gupta, Counsel for the Respondent has submitted that due to some problem in software termed as "software glitch", the delay was caused in energizing the connection. The connection was finally energized on 09.04.2005. It was further submitted that the system has been strengthened and they are now in a position to energise new connections within seven days after a consumer deposits the requisite amount as per demand note.
- 5) Shri V. P. Gupta, the Complainant, has submitted that he did not want to pursue the complaint further as his grievance has already been redressed by the Respondent by installing and energizing the meter in his premises.
- 6) The Commission have considered the submissions of both the parties. Although the Complainant has submitted that he did not want to pursue the matter further, the Commission cannot lose sight of the fact that there was undue delay on the part of the Licensee, firstly, to issue a demand note and secondly, to energise the connection after deposit of the said amount as per the demand note on 21.02.2005. The Respondent Licensee is, therefore, advised to be more careful and avoid such delays in future.
- 7) Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(R. Krishnamoorthy)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
CHAIRMAN