

Office of Electricity Ombudsman

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act, 2003)

B-53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi – 110 057

(Phone No.: 32506011, Fax No.26141205)

Appeal No. F. ELECT/Ombudsman/2007/149

Appeal against Order dated 16.01.2007 passed by CGRF – BRPL in Case No.:
CG/445/2006 (K.No.2541 C632 0625)

In the matter of:

Mrs. Sarita Gautam - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant Shri J.P. Gautam, husband of the Appellant

Respondent Shri S.C. Sharma, Addl. General Manager and
Shri Prashant Verma, Business Manager on behalf of BRPL

Date of Hearing: 19.06.2007, 27.06.2007

Date of Order : 26.07.2007

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2007/149

Appellant has filed this appeal against CGRF-BRPL order dated 16.01.2007 in case no. CG/445/2006 stating that there is massive theft from his meter resulting in heavy bills. His earlier consumption was far less and October 2006 bill is for 4589 units. Appellant has prayed that his bills be corrected and the extra amount in the bill may be billed to the owner of flat no. A-61, who is causing the theft.

After calling for records from the CGRF and examining the submissions of BRPL and the issues raised in the appeal, the case was fixed for hearing on 19.06.2007.

On 19.06.2007 Shri J. P. Gautam, husband of the appellant attended.

Shri S. C. Sharma, AGM and Shri Prashant Verma, Business Manager attended on behalf of the respondent.

During the hearing, Shri Gautam emphasized that as the theft of electricity was being committed by the owner of flat no. A-61 from his meter as such his bills may be revised on the basis of his past average consumption. He disputed the readings shown in the bill of October 2006 for consumption of 4589 units.

Respondent officials informed that the theft was being committed by the neighbour after the point of supply by the meter, but BRPL is responsible for only supply of electricity up to the meter. Appellant stated that he had made a complaint with the police for this theft but no action was taken. Respondent officials further informed that a case of misuse and direct theft of electricity has already been booked against the owner of flat no. A-61.

Appellant was informed that theft cases are outside the purview of Electricity Ombudsman, therefore he may approach the appropriate forum for this purpose.

Regarding wrong reading / inflated bill of October 2006, the discom officials informed that meter reader could not take correct reading as meter was lying under lock and key. Scrutiny of meter reading record revealed that:

- (i) The Meter was replaced by the discom on 27.04.2005 and its first reading recorded on 19.06.2005 was 2004 units i.e. showing a consumption of 2004 units in a period of 53 days. This seems to be rather high as compared with average consumption of old meter as well as with average consumption recorded for a period of 1 year by the new meter. Respondent officials could not produce meter change report wherein initial reading of new meter and final reading of old meter is required to be recorded. In absence of meter change particulars initial reading of new meter and final reading of old meter could not be confirmed.
- (ii) It was also observed that all bills were paid up to reading 6896 recorded on 09.06.2006. August 2006 bill was issued for zero consumption but with actual bill status. October 2006 bill shows reading of 11485 units as on 23 October 2006. The bill for October 2006 is issued for (11485 – 6896) 4589 units for 56 days (Sept + part Oct.) whereas this should have been for (80 + 56) 136 days (i.e. from 9.6.2006 – 23.10.2006) since zero consumption bill was issued for August 2006.

The officials of the discom were directed to revise the bill as below:

- (a) w.e.f. 09.06.2006 to 23.10.2006 for 4589 units and
- (b) prior to 19.06.2005 billing cycle on the basis of average consumption of 6 months w.e.f. 19.06.2005 to 19.12.2005 as meter change particulars were not produced, also the first reading of 2004 units of new meter appeared quite high. BRPL officials were directed to submit the detailed calculations with revised payable amount on 27.06.2007.

On 27.06.2007 Business Manager attended this office and submitted the details of revised bill according to which the bill amount payable up to 12.06.2007 comes to Rs.2,620/- after waiving off LPSC amount of Rs.318/- which will be deleted in the next billing cycle.

The appellant is directed to make the payment of the revised bill in accordance with calculations submitted above.

The order of CGRF is set aside.

महेश मेहरा
(Asha Mehra)
Ombudaman