

141

**Office of 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/2006/96**

Appeal against Order dated 19.05.2006 passed by CGRF – NDPL on CG.No. 0708/04/06/RHN (K.No. 44300422237)

**In the matter of:**

Shri P.C. Paul

- Appellant

**Versus**

M/s North Delhi Power Ltd.

- Respondent

**Present:-**

**Appellant** Shri P.C. Paul

**Respondent** Shri Rajesh Behl, District Manager,  
Shri Manish Makkar, Legal Retainer, NDPL  
Shri Suraj Das Guru, Executive (Legal) all on behalf of NDPL

Date of Hearing: 06.09.2006

Date of Order : 08.09.2006

**ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2006/96**

This appeal is filed on 12.06.06 against CGRF-NDPL's order dated 19.5.2006 in respect of K. No. 44300122237 in the premises of Shri P.C. Paul at C-8/27, Sector-VII, Rohini. After calling the records from CGRF and examination of the contents of the appeal, relevant information was sought from the Respondent in regard to the issues raised by the Appellant.

The case was fixed for hearing on 6.9.2006. The appellant attended in person. Shri Rajesh Behl, District Manager, Shri Manish Makkar, Legal Retainer NDPL and Shri Suraj Das Guru (Legal) attended on behalf of the respondent company.

The facts of the case as emerged from the above documents filed and the discussions during the hearing are given as under:-

- (1) The Appellant's meter was burnt on 8.3.2004. He lodged a complaint at 10 AM and supply was restored at 11 PM the same day. However, the burnt meter was replaced on 12.4.2004 i.e. after 35 days of the complaint, although it should have been done within 3

days as per DERC guidelines. This is a serious deficiency on the part of the respondent company.

- (2) The next issue is regarding the assessment to be done for the disputed period. According to the licensee company, before burning of the meter on 8.3.2004, the last reading recorded on 9.2.2004 was 19758 units. The previous reading was 18600 units on 8.12.2003. In the CGRF order it is stated that assessment was done for the period 9.2.2004 to 12.4.2004 on basis of actual consumption from 12.4.2004 to 10.2.2005 i.e. a period of 10 months. This shows that the base period adopted by the respondent company is not as per the DERC guidelines. The CGRF also failed to notice this error and observed that the consumer had been charged correctly.

The meter changing sheet filed by the respondent company shows the last reading of the burnt meter was 16976 at the time of replacement of burnt meter on 12.4.2004. This would mean that when the meter was burnt on 8.3.2004 the reading was 16976. If that is so, then how reading a month, earlier i.e. on 9.2.04 was recorded at a higher figure of 19758. The above two readings only show that both the readings are not correct because the burnt meter reading on 12.4.2004 (16976 is lesser than the reading recorded four months earlier on 8.12.2003 which was 18600). Thus, both the readings being incorrect are, not reliable.

In view of the above, the defective period may be taken as 8.12.2003 to 12.4.2004. Assessment may be done on the basis of average of six months before 8.12.03 and six months after 12.4.2004.

In the appeal filed by the Appellant, it is stated that he has been harassed a lot by the officials of the respondent company and has sought compensation for intentional harassment to a senior citizen. It also came to notice that he had difficulty for paying one-third "**of the assessed amount**" which is a statutory requirement prior to the filing of the appeal before the Ombudsman. The Appellant sought the help of the Secretary of the Ombudsman to enable him to deposit the required amount although, the officials of the respondent company are well aware of this requirement (for filing the appeal).

Harassment of a consumer, who has perforce to deal with the officials of the Licensee Company, cannot be allowed to continue. An end must be put to this, more so a senior citizen cannot be allowed to be harassed for no fault of his. Although no amount of compensation can adequately make up for the harassment suffered by a person, a token compensation of Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two thousand only) is awarded to the appellant for the harassment suffered at the hands of the officials of the respondent company.

**The order of the CGRF is set aside.**

  
( Asha Mehra )  
Ombudsman

Page 2 of 2