

(131)

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/2013/525

Appeal against the Order dated 10.09.2012 passed by CGRF–BRPL in CG.No.61/2012.

In the matter of:

Shri Thakur Dass - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant: Shri Thakur Dass was present in person.

Respondent: Shri Brijesh Kumar Jha, DGM (CC), Shri Kashmir Singh, DGM (B) and Shri K.L. Meena, Dy. FO (B), attended on behalf of the BRPL.

Date of Hearing: 02.01.2013, 05.03.2013

Date of Order : 09.04.2013

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2013/525

The Appellant, Shri Thakur Dass, husband of the registered consumer Smt. Rajni, R/o I-13/1269, Sangam Vihar, New Delhi-110062, has filed an appeal against the order of CGRF – BRPL (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Rajdhani Power Limited) dated 10.09.2012 in which the CGRF closed the case in his absence.

The facts of the case are the complainant had filed his case before the CGRF stating that there is one electricity connection CA No.101885592, installed on 09.03.2011, in the name of his wife Smt. Rajni. No reading was ever taken by the BRPL (DISCOM). No bills were received. There was a mistake on the part of the DISCOM in not sending electricity bills on a timely basis. It seems the Appellant did not also make any enquiry in respect of electricity bills, as argued by the DISCOM.

123

The reading was done only on 07.02.2012 when the DISCOM's official visited his premises and removed the meter, without giving any show-cause notice, and furnishing a bill of Rs.22,040/-. He approached the DISCOM about this alleged excess billing. The DISCOM then issued a revised bill of Rs.14,510/- out of which he paid Rs.4,000/- on 11.02.2012. The DISCOM informed him that the supply would be restored only after deposit of the full payment.

His prayer to the CGRF was for correction in the excess bill after restoration of the electricity supply. The DISCOM had filed a reply before the CGRF that the bill has been revised to Rs.14,570/- after giving the slab benefit. The CGRF passed an ex-parte order on 10.09.2012 awarding a compensation of Rs.1000/- to be credited in her connection on account of harassment. The CGRF noted that the DISCOM had issued a revised bill and the electricity had also been restored.

In his appeal, the Appellant stated that he could not appear before the CGRF as he was out of station on that day and he is not satisfied with the order of the CGRF. The DISCOM opposed this appeal stating that on receipt of Rs.4000/-, the supply was reconnected on 06.03.2012. The same was again disconnected on 31.10.2012 due to non-payment of the balance amount. Again, he made a payment of Rs.10,000/- on 01.11.2012 but the bill has since accumulated to Rs.20,490/-. His electricity connection was again restored on 06.11.2012.

A hearing was held on 02.01.2013 and both the parties were heard. The DISCOM stated that the CGRF order has been complied with. A credit of Rs.4000/- has been given and a compensation of Rs.1000/- has been paid. The DISCOM was advised to file the proof of the same to this office and also explain the details to the consumer.

This was done by the DISCOM in the interim, but as the Appellant was still not satisfied with the details of the bill raised and amounts adjusted, a hearing was, accordingly, fixed on 05.03.2013.

On 05.03.2013, the Appellant wanted to have the current consumption pattern of today applied to the past period for which a bill of Rs.14,500/- was received.

However, this is not possible as per rules. The reading taken on 07.02.2012 could not be controverted. The DISCOM was advised to issue a final calculation for the entire period from March, 2011 to February, 2011, divided into 2 months periods billing cycle, with proper slabs applied. The DISCOM was advised to show adjustment of Rs.4000/- paid as well as the compensation of Rs.1000/- given to the Appellant. The details were furnished on 19.03.2013 by the Discom confirming therein that proper slabs have been applied and credit given for the payments made by the consumer.

It is curious to note that the DISCOM could first down-load the readings only on 20.12.2011, due to technical issues, though the meter was installed on 15.03.2011. The bill for Rs.22,040/- was presented to the Appellant in December, 2012/January, 2013 and he did not make payment till 07.02.2012 when the meter was removed from the Appellant's premises. Not having submitted a bill for almost 9-10 months, the DISCOM was now not willing to wait more than a month and a half to receive full payment and took the extreme step of removing the meter. There is no record of any installments having been offered in lieu of the delay in submitting a proper bill. Subsequently, the bill was also revised downward to Rs.14,510/-. This is a curious set of circumstances which seems to indicate that the DISCOM was not being entirely fair with the Appellant by cutting off his electric supply not once but twice.

Even now, although the CGRF order does not warrant any substantial change, it would be necessary for the DISCOM to offer installments and satisfy him regarding the adjustment of various credits ordered by the CGRF. The amount fixed as compensation for harassment is too little and should be revised to Rs.3,000/-. Appeal is disposed off with these orders.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman


April, 2013

(

()