

**Office of the 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/2012/487**

Appeal against the Order dated 30.12.2011 passed by CGRF-BRPL  
CG.No. 367/2011.

**In the matter of:**

**Smt. Savita Oberoi - Appellant**

**Versus**

**M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent**

**Present:-**

**Appellant: The Appellant Smt. Savita Oberoi was present in person**

**Respondent: Shri Vinay Singh, G.M. and Pushpdeep Jaisiya, B.M. attended on behalf of the BRPL**

**Date of Hearing: 03.07.2012**

**Date of Order : 23.07.2012**

**ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2012/487**

The Appellant, Ms. Savita Oberoi on behalf of the registered consumer, Ms. Pooja Kamra, has filed this appeal against the order dated 30.12.2011 passed by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (CGRF-BRPL) in CG No.367/2011 regarding highly inflated bill of Rs.14,299/-. Ms. Savita Oberoi had contended that the BRPL (DISCOM) raised a bill amounting to Rs.14,299/- in the month of July, 2012 against her electricity connection bearing CRN No.2540150420 installed at B-29, Lajpat Nagar, Part-II, New Delhi-110024, with a sanctioned load of 3 Kw for domestic use.

The DISCOM stated before the CGRF that the meter of the complainant has been tested on 20.07.2011 with a remark "Meter working is OK" ( + 1.19%) and on 25.07.2011 with a remark "Meter working is OK" (+1.95%) respectively and testing results were found within the permissible limits. The Appellant, not satisfied with the testing of the meter by the DISCOM, had requested for third party testing of the meter. The CGRF-BRPL also simultaneously directed the installation of a check meter to check the consumption variation(s). The check meter was installed on 05.10.2011. The third party testing was done by the Electrical Research and Development Association (ERDA) for the consumer's meter as well as check meter on 12.10.2011. The results of both meters were found to be within permissible limits and was, thus, found OK, as per rules.

The CGRF-BRPL, further, directed the DISCOM that a check meter already installed by the Respondent may be continued to see the variation, if any, for the satisfaction of the consumer.

The perusal of the Consumption variation recorded by the main consumer's meter and check meter from 05.10.2011 (date of installation of check meter) to 14.04.2012 (date of removal of check meter) shows a variation of +0.55%, thus, confirming the consumer's meter to be OK.

The Appellant, further, stated in her appeal that the Chairman-CGRF in a separate "Chamber meeting" convened for the purpose, ordered the DISCOM on 28<sup>th</sup> March, 2012 to get the excess amount waived off.

The DISCOM contended in its reply that while the 'Chamber Meeting' was held on 28.03.2012 to analyze consumption variation of both the main as well as check meters but the Chairman-CGRF had not given any such instructions.

The DISCOM, further contended that the Maximum Demand Indicator (MDI) readings recorded in the months of July-2011, September-2011 & November-2011 are 4.6 Kw, 4.9 Kw & 4.08 Kw respectively against the sanctioned load of 3 Kw. The bills

have been raised accordingly as per recorded/downloaded consumption and cannot be waived off.

In view of the foregoing facts, it is observed that both the main (no.22350817), as well as check (no.24350653) meters were showing a consumption variation only of + 0.55% during the period 05.10.2011 to 14.04.2012. This confirms that the consumers meter is OK as has been found earlier on three earlier occasions of testing.

A hearing was held in the matter on 03.07.2012. Both the parties were heard. The complainant again argued that the Chairman-CGRF held a meeting in his chamber and 'ordered' the DISCOM to waive off her disputed dues. No such 'order' is seen on record, which has been seen in detail.

The DISCOM confirmed the check meter was functioning till April 2012, and was showing no problem with the original meter. In the circumstances there is no merit in the complaint. The CGRF Order is upheld and the Appeal is dismissed. The case may be closed.

A Compliance Report of this order may be submitted within 21 days.

  
(PRADEEP SINGH)  
OMBUDSMAN

23rd July, 2012

