

(329)

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/2013/578

Appeal against the Order dated 09.07.2013 passed by CGRF–TPDDL in CG.No.5161/04/13/MDT.

In the matter of:

Shri Vijay Gupta - Appellant

Versus

M/s Tata Power Delhi Distribution Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-


Appellant : Shri H. B. Jha, advocate, attended on behalf of the Appellant.

Respondent : Shri Vivek, Sr. Manager (Legal) and Shri Gagan Sharma, Sr. Officer, attended on behalf of the TPDDL.

Date of Hearing : 25.09.2013

Date of Order : 04.11.2013

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2013/578

(
 This appeal has been filed by the complainant, Shri Vijay Gupta S/o Shri R.S. Gupta, resident of H. No.258, Adarsh Nagar, Dharam Kanta Village, Sarai Pipal Thala, Delhi-110033, against the order of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum (CGRF) dated 09.07.2013 in which the Tata Power Delhi Distribution Limited (TPDDL) bill was found correct and the complainant was ordered to pay the billed amount and no amount is refundable.

(225)

The complainant had filed his case before the CGRF stating that he had received an impugned bill of Rs.1,04,120/- which had shown consumption of 13277 units for the period of 26.06.2010 to 16.02.2013, during which he argued, his shop was closed (since 2010) which had already been informed to the TPDDL (DISCOM).

The DISCOM filed its reply before the CGRF stating that the consumption was 13221 units from 26.02.2008 to 21.03.2009 with an average of 1005 units per month, and 8506 units from 21.03.2009 to 02.03.2010, with an average of 735 units per month. This was higher than the consumption of 13227 units recorded during 26.06.2010 to 16.02.2013 (the period in dispute) with an average of 413 units per month but the consumption did not come to a halt as it would have if the premises were not being used. So the contention of the complainant that the shop was closed and there was no use of the connection is not borne out. A revised bill was issued as per consumption recorded in the meter.

Now the complainant has filed the present appeal in which he has reasserted the contention made before the CGRF.

Both the parties were heard. The Complainant is not able to show any facts, or advance any arguments, as to how the CGRF's conclusion that the average consumption shows the shop was not closed can be set aside.

In view of the above, the appeal does not succeed. Case closed.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman


November, 2013