

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/2014/649

Appeal against the Order dated 21.07.2014 passed by CGRF—
BRPL in CG.No.857/2013.

In the matter of:

Shri Rajinder Kumar Bharti - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant: Shri Rajinder Kumar Bharti was not present

Respondent: Shri Sudhir Jairath, D.G.M. (JKP), attended on behalf of
the BRPL.

Date of Hearing : 11.11.2014

Date of Order : 19.11.2014

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2014/649

This is an appeal filed by Shri Rajinder Kumar Bharti, R/o I-56, Kirti Nagar, New Delhi - 110015, against the order of the CGRF dated 21.07.2014 in which his request for quashing a demand of Rs.60,200/- raised by the DISCOM was declined by the CGRF on the ground that the temporary connection for construction had been given based on which a bill was raised which the consumer had a liability to pay. The CGRF did not accept the plea of the complainant that the meter was faulty and had been reported to have been giving sparking in 2012.

A hearing was held on 11.11.2014 and the complainant was not present. A few minutes prior to the hearing he had telephonically asked the office for time and a fresh date. However, the DISCOM was heard to ascertain the facts. These show that a temporary connection (CA No.350189023) for construction was given which incurred the above amount. This amount not having been paid, the temporary connection was disconnected on 28.02.2013. In the meanwhile, the consumer had also obtained a permanent electricity connection (CA.150623039) on 04.01.2013 at the same premises. The amount outstanding on the temporary connection (CA No.350189023) was transferred to the permanent electricity connection (CA No.150623039) vide notice issued on 21.10.2013. Within one month i.e. on 22.11.2013, the owner approached the CGRF objecting to the earlier bill & meter and a hearing was held and orders were passed on 21.07.2014 rejecting his claim. In his approach to the CGRF the complainant based his claim on sparking and a defective meter. The meter of the temporary connection (CA No. 350189023), which had been removed on 28.02.2013 was tested at this stage and found to be working O.K. hence the orders of the CGRF above.

It is clear from the sequence of events above that the complaint regarding non-functioning of meter of the temporary connection is a belated attempt to avoid payment of dues incurred against it which were transferred to his permanent electricity connection. The complainant was unable to provide proof/record of any complaint of sparking made on 16.12.2012. If the complainant had to rely upon

the malfunctioning of the meter, third party testing should have been requested prior to the meter being removed for non-payment. In any case, the meter that had been removed was found O.K. on testing. There was no attempt by the complainant from February, 2013, when the meter was removed for non-payment, till October, 2013, when dues were to be transferred to his permanent connection to resolve all issues of meter malfunctioning/payment relating to the temporary connection.

Under the circumstances, this is a clear case of non-payment of bill against the temporary connection and there is no substance in the appeal. The consumer was silent from 28.02.2013 till 21.10.2013 when the notice of transfer of dues was issued to him. This undermines the genuineness of this claim.

The appeal is, therefore, dismissed and the case is closed.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman

19 HK

November, 2014

