

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

CG-292/09/2005

Shri Vijay Kumar Bali,
9/4327, Gali No. 9,
Ajit Nagar, Gandhi Nagar,
Delhi-110031.

.....Complainant

VERSUS

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

.....Respondent

Coram :

Sh. Berjinder Singh, Chairman & Sh. K. Venugopal, Member .

Appearance :

1. Sh. V.K. Bali, Complainant.
2. Sh. Rarry Mangsatabam, Counsel for BYPL.
3. Ms. Neeta Mutum, Counsel for BYPL.
4. Sh. C.P. Singh, C.O. BYPL.
5. Sh. S.R. Dev, BYPL.
6. Sh. Naveen Kumar, Sr. Officer (Legal) BYPL.

ORDER

(Date of Hearing : 28.3.2006)

(Date of Order : 10.4.2006)

1. The instant case file has been referred to the Commission from the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum of BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. with a proposal for imposition of penalty on the Licensee.

2. From the records submitted to this Commission, it is revealed that the consumer had sought installation of a new connection. It is stated by the Consumer that he had deposited the requisite fees for the site inspection. The Licensee after verification of the records found that there were outstanding arrears of Rs.27290/- on the said premises. The site inspection therefore, was not undertaken by the Licensee. The Licensee rejected the application of the consumer on the grounds that there were arrears against the K. No. 1220R8130065 which was installed in the same premises.

...Contd. N.P.

3. It is revealed from the records that the consumer has paid the bill on 5.10.2005 and thereafter, the meter was installed on 7.10.2005. The Forum, by a majority decision, held that there was a violation of the Regulations and had recommended an appropriate penalty to be imposed under Regulation 30 of the DERC (Performance Standards – Metering & Billing) Regulations, 2002.

4. Mr. Rarry Mangsatabam, Counsel for the BSES Yamuna Power Ltd. has submitted that the records of the Licensee showed arrears against the premises where the new connection was sought. It is stated by the Counsel that the site was not visited due to pending arrears. Further, the consumer cleared the arrear bill on 5.10.2005, thereafter, on 7.10.2005 the meter was installed and on 10.10.2005 the connection was energised. It is stated that the consumer had agreed for a settlement on the issue and had withdrawn the grievance after being satisfied that no dispute remained with the Licensee.

5. Sh. V.K. Bali appearing in person also states that he is satisfied since his connection has been given and that the matter was settled as compromised. It has been seen that there were outstanding dues on the meter connection in the same premises and as soon as those outstanding dues were settled, the new connection has been given. In view of the submissions made by the parties, the Commission is of the opinion that since the matter was mutually settled and the Forum had also given certain compensation to the Complainant for the delay in energising the new connection, there is no further cause for the Commission to intervene in the matter. Further, the Commission is of the opinion that this is not a fit case for imposition of a penalty on the Licensee. Accordingly, the Show-Cause Notice dated 01.02.2006 issued to the Licensee stands discharged and no further action is required thereon.

6. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(K. Venugopal)
Member

Sd/-
(Berjinder Singh)
Chairman