

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/2015/684

Appeal against the Order dated 30.12.2014 passed by CGRF–BRPL in CG.No.616/2014.

In the matter of:

Shri Amrit Singh - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant: Shri Amrit Singh was present in person.

Respondent: Shri Ishfaq Ahmed Beigh, DGM (B) attended on behalf of the BRPL.

Date of Hearing : 28.04.2015

Date of Order : 30.04.2015

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2015/684

This complaint has been filed by Shri Amrit Singh, R/o WZ-675, Shiv Nagar Extn., Jail Road, New Delhi – 110058, against the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum – BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. (CGRF-BRPL) order dated 30.12.2014, requesting for refund of Rs.4000/- debited by the BRPL (DISCOM) on account of service line cum development (SLD) charges. The CGRF had refused to intervene in the matter on the ground that SLD charges are recovered from the consumer as per DERC order/rules.

A hearing was held on 28.04.2015. The complainant, who is 87 years old, stated that he is unable to understand the order issued by the CGRF as in


his view it cannot demand SLD charges because earlier also the load had increased to 7 KW, which later reduced to 5 KW and again increased to 7 KW. The representative of the DISCOM explained that the earlier load increase to 7 KW was not charged for SLD charges due to an error. The SLD charges now levied cannot be refunded as per the DERC's instructions allow them to levy the charges. The background of the SLD charges was then explained in detail to the complainant and it was pointed out that even though the upgradation of the network may not be visible to the consumer in that no cables etc. are changed in or near the premises of the consumer the upgradation of things like transformers, sub-stations is taking place which has to be paid for by the consumers through SLD charges. There was a detailed discussion on some other issues raised by the complainant but ultimately he understood the nature of the SLD charges and why they are levied. He did, however, express his dissatisfaction with the casual manner in which the DISCOM's staff treated him and refused to explain to him in as much detail as he had now been given.

It is seen that unnecessary litigation before the CGRF and the Ombudsman could have been avoided through better communication as the matter was quite clear from the very outset but had not been properly explained to the senior citizen. This is a problem that occurs frequently in the DISCOMs and has been noted in Orders issued earlier also.

It is desirable that the DISCOM should review the reasons due to which litigation takes place in order to see if any specific action by their own staff could have helped to avoid it. In the present case, a better communication with a senior citizen with proper explanations being given on why SLD charges are levied could have avoided the entire litigation. For this the DISCOM has only itself to blame as it has exhibited a deficiency in service. It cannot be argued that every complainant/consumer automatically knows the entire rules and regulations and how they impact them. These also have to be explained to them by the staff of the DISCOM in a proper and helpful manner.

While the appeal cannot be accepted on merits the deficiency pointed above requires the DISCOM to compensate the complainant for the expenses incurred and an amount of Rs.1,500/- is considered adequate for the purpose which may be adjusted through the electricity bill.

The appeal is, therefore, disposed off as above.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman
30th April, 2015

