

## **DELHI ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi – 110017

### **Petition No. 63/2008**

#### **In the matter of:**

Sh. Anil Kohli  
49-C, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor,  
Savitri Nagar Main Road,  
New Delhi-110017.

**.....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. Shyam Wadhera, Member.**

#### **Appearance:**

1. Sh. D. Seth, Addl. V.P. (B), BRPL;
2. Sh. S.K. Kansal, DGM, BRPL (Saket);
3. Sh. Shri Ram Tripathi, C.O., BRPL (Saket);
4. Sh. Anil Kohli, Complainant.

### **ORDER**

(Date of Hearing: 26.11.2008)

(Date of Order: 19.01.2009)

1. The case in brief is that Sh. Anil Kohli has alleged continuous harassment at the hands of BRPL owing to certain disputed dues. The application of Shri Kohli, dated 28.01.2008 reveals that no meter reading was recorded by the Discom, BRPL for the last more than 2 years and he is being billed @ Rs.5.35/kWh for the entire past period. When he sought redressal of his grievance through PGC, a raid was conducted by BRPL at his premises but, the findings thereof were not communicated to him.

2. The complainant vide his letter dated 24.10.2008 has submitted that his meter was removed three times in a period of 18 months. He has further submitted that as per his analysis, the main problem in supply of electricity rests with the bus bar distribution system of the Respondent Licensee. The complainant has leveled specific allegations against Shri S. K. Kansal, who is DGM in his area of supply. He has submitted that his meter has been removed three times at the instance of Shri S. K. Kansal.

3. The Respondent in its reply has refuted the allegations of the complainant. The Respondent has submitted that the meter was removed from the premises of the complainant on 29.01.2008 due to non payment of dues and after the complainant paid an amount of Rs.30,000 as interim payment on 31.07.2008, the meter was restored. The Respondent has stated that there was no discrepancy in the bill and all bills have been raised as per the actual consumption recorded by the meter. The Respondent has reflected the consumption of electricity at two levels – consumption upto 29.01.2008 which was 1494 units and the consumption after 29.01.2008 i.e. initial reading of new meter no. 22804021 installed at the premises of the complainant on 01.02.2008 was 03 and consumption up to 20.02.2008 was 2301 units. This reading is inclusive of the reading recorded up to 29.01.2008 which was 1494 units. However, on calculation of total consumption as reflected in Respondent's letter dated 05.09.2008, it is found that the figure of total consumption comes to 2031 units instead of 2301 units.

4. Shri Anil Kohli, the complainant is present in person. He has contended before the Commission that he is being harassed by the officials of the Respondent for no fault of his for the last two years as the Respondent is raising the bills against him in a reckless manner. He further submitted that his electricity connection was disconnected even when his complaint was pending before the Commission.

5. The representative of BRPL Shri S. K. Kansal, DGM, submitted before the Commission that the meter was initially replaced on 09.05.2007 as it was found slow by -3.30% during testing. Shri Kansal further submitted that the complainant was served a notice under Section 56 of the Electricity Act, 2003 on 17.12.2007 which was not acknowledged by the Complainant. Therefore, the electricity supply to his connection was disconnected and the meter was removed on 29.01.2008 as a part of recovery process on account of non payment of outstanding dues which was restored on 01.02.2008 on payment of partial amount of Rs.30,000/-. Thereafter, the electricity supply was again disconnected on 13.10.2008 on account of non payment of outstanding dues.

6. On hearing the arguments of both sides and perusal of the pleadings, the Commission is of the view that the complainant has been put to a lot of harassment. Sh. S.K. Kansal, being Business Manager, seems to have not discharged his duties diligently but, rather acted in an irresponsible manner. The Commission directs that the officer be issued a reprimand and be cautioned to treat consumer grievances with due diligence, sensitivity and promptitude. The

CEO, BRPL should look into the grievance of the Complainant and submit a report to the Commission within one month from the date of receipt of this Order. Thereafter, the Commission may pass further orders, if considered necessary. A copy of this Order be also sent to other DISCOMs for appropriate action in their respective areas of supply to prevent such incidents in future.

7. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-  
(Shyam Wadhera)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(K. Venugopal)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Berjinder Singh)  
CHAIRMAN