

64

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/2007/153

Appeal against Order dated 12.02.2007 passed by CGRF – BRPL in Case No.CG/459-06 (K.No. 2551 OF19 0029).

In the matter of:

Shri Manu Sehgal - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant Shri Manu Sehgal, the appellant attended along with his father Shri O.P. Sehgal

Respondent Shri S.C. Sharma, Addl. General Manager (Bus.)
Shri Chander Mohan, Addl. General Manager (O&M),
Shri Sachin Gupta, Business Manager,
Shri Dinesh Ranjan, Manager (O&M) and
Shri D.R. Madan, Asstt. Manager attended on behalf of BRPL

Date of Hearing: 12.06.2007

Date of Order : 20.06.2007

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2007/153

Appellant filed this appeal against CGRF order dated 12.02.2007. In his appeal it is sated that his electrical equipments got damaged due to spikes (voltage fluctuation), in electric supply. The repairs of these equipment cost him Rs.18,470/- whereas CGRF allowed a token compensation of Rs.2000/- only.

The appellant informed BRPL vide his letter dated 18.12.2006 that due to spikes in the supply of electricity by the Discom, in the last few months, the electrical equipment installed in his premises has got damaged. Complaint nos. 552 and 1024 dated 09.12.2006 were lodged in this regard. It is stated in his appeal that similar problem is reported from other houses getting supply from the

Delhi and no such complaint regarding voltage fluctuation have been received from others.

- (d) Existing LT system is sufficient enough to cater to the load of the area and there had been no breakdown or interruption of supply to the consumer due to any deficiency in the existing LT network at site, during the last five months.
- (e) In view of the above, the appellant was not entitled to compensation but as per the orders of the CGRF, credit of Rs.2,000/- has already been given to the consumer through his electricity consumption bills.
- (f) All the protection gears required in the distribution system as per the best practices is already available in the network from where the consumer is getting supply and as such, no further modification is required in the LT network at the moment.
- (g) Respondent officials further submitted that the cost of repair of electrical equipments at the complainants premises are not payable by BRPL since the failure of equipments at the premises are not attributable to BRPL supply.

It is evident from record that appellant made complaints of serious spikes on 09.12.2006 vide complaint no. 552 and 1024. But the bills for repair of the electrical gadgets pertain to July 2006, October 2006 and December 2006. It is also true that no complaint of such fluctuations was made by him prior to 09.12.2006. The observations of the CGRF in its order appear to be very general in nature, that the possibility of complaint with regard to high voltage could not be ruled out particularly when the leads of the LT cable got burnt out and obviously the neutral of the main LT cable might have come in contact with one of the phase causes excess voltage. The exact cause of excess high voltage has not been specified. One cannot disagree with respondent's submission i.e. if such a thing happened then high voltage would have occurred in the premises of all the residents who had been getting the supply from this main cable whereas no such complaints of high voltage or damage to their equipments were received from other consumers.

Photocopies of repair bills as mentioned in the CGRF order produced by the appellant are as follows:-

- (1) Bill no. 197 dated 05.12.2006 from IKON Services, charging compressor change with Gas-Rs.4080/-.
- (2) Bill no. 30 dated 09.10.2006 from Crown-Tech Enterprises for GTO-Rs.1250/-.
- (3) Bill No. 1456 dated 21.07.2006 from MICROTEK International (P) Ltd. for Service charge of Inverter Cord. – Rs.1200/-.
- (4) Bill No. AM8163 dated 17.07.2006 from SHRI GANESH AUTO PARTS CENTRE for Inverter damage (computer replacement) – Rs.6800/-.

21

The CGRF has rightly observed that these repair bills relate to the period prior to 09.12.2006, when the complaint regarding fluctuations was made to the Discom. The CGRF also observed that it is difficult to correlate the repair of equipments with respect to the phenomenon of fluctuation of voltage scrupulously at this belated stage.

Considering the above arguments of the appellant and the respondent and on consideration of facts available from record it is clear that the damage of the electrical equipment cannot be attributed to the supply of electricity by the Discom. There is, therefore, no case of compensation / re-imbusement of Rs.18,470/- being the cost of the repair of the appellants electrical equipment from 17.06.2006 to 05.12.2006.

The order dated 12.02.2007 of the CGRF is upheld to the extent of compensation of Rs 2,000/-.

अशा मेहरा
(Asha Mehra)
Ombudsman