

(25)

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/2012/528

Appeal against the Order dated 23.10.2012 passed by CGRF—
BRPL in CG.No.04-2012.

In the matter of:

Mrs. Mercy Wilson - Appellant

Versus

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

(Appellant: Shri Naveen Wilson, S/o Mrs. Mercy Wilson, attended on
behalf of the appellant

Respondent: Shri A. P. Ram, G.M. (Business) – Saket, attended on
behalf of the BRPL.

Date of Hearing: 16.01.2013

Date of Order : 21.01.2013

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2013/528

(The Appellant, Mrs. Mercy Wilson, resident of Flat No.6, Khasra
No.407/2, Neb Sarai, New Delhi – 110068, has filed an appeal against an
order of the CGRF-BRPL (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES
Rajdhani Power Limited) dated 23.10.2012 wherein it had been ordered that
a check meter be installed to compare the consumption of both meters
(check and existing) on a fortnightly basis for a period of six months. In the
meanwhile, the consumer was to pay 80% of all bills received by her
including the then current bill due on 18.09.2012.

(21)

The Appellant filed an appeal on the ground that she had received another bill for the period 19.08.2012 to 15.10.2012 which includes arrears and late payment charges. She contended that the DISCOM is not following the CGRF order.

A hearing was held on 16.01.2013 and the DISCOM was advised to strictly follow the CGRF order asking the consumer to pay 80% of the bill till the period of six months (3 billing cycles) is over. There would naturally be no late payment surcharge in the matter.

Further, the matter has to go back to the CGRF sometime in March or April, 2013 for a final decision and hence the complaint filed in this office in November, 2012 should really have been filed with the CGRF itself.

During the hearing, the DISCOM was also asked to assist the consumer in finding out the causes of the alleged high consumption as compared to previous periods and as compared to others living in the same premises so that when the matter is taken up by the CGRF a proper decision is given.

The case is ordered to be remanded to the CGRF for further action as per their order of 23.10.2012.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman

21st January, 2013