

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 380/2009

Date of Institution: 03.08.2009

Date of Decision : 06.01.2010

In the matter of

Smt. Sarla Rani W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road, Ch. Dadri (Bhiwani)

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Sarla Rani W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road, Ch. Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani for the interest on the ACD deposited with the Nigam while taking the connection.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 04.12.2009, SDO was directed to get the interest on the ACD calculated and adjust the same in the account of the petitioner.

To-day the Nodal Officer/SDO concerned submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer vide his memo No.Ch.18/Forum-380 /BWN dated 6.1.2010 stating therein that the amount deposited by the consumer as ACD has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 287/34R. The refundable amount has been credited in his bill for the month of 7/01 and minus balance (-) Rs.5289/- was outstanding at that time and this amount along with interest of ACD year-wise admissible as per rates fixed by the HSEB/DHBVN has been adjusted in Account No. RRC 3/30 (now A/C No.CP-31/0005) in his bill for the month of 11/2009, as per undertaking given by the petitioner.

SDO further requested for closure of the case. As per report of the SDO, the view point of the SDO is found to be in order and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 381/2009

Date of Institution: 03.08.2009

Date of Decision : 06.01.2010

In the matter of

M/s Atul Filaments Pvt.Ltd.Rohtak Road,Ch.Dadri(Bhiwani) .

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by M/s Atul Filaments Pvt. Ltd., Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani for the interest on the ACD deposited with the Nigam while taking the connection.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 04.12.2009, SDO was directed to get the interest on the ACD calculated and adjust the same in the account of the petitioner.

To-day the Nodal Officer/SDO concerned submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer vide his memo No.Ch.18/Forum-381 /BWN dated 6.1.2010 stating therein that the amount deposited by the consumer as ACD has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 117/100R. The refundable amount along with interest as per rates fixed by the HSEB/DHBVN has been credited in his bill for the month of 11/2009, bearing Account No. RW-41-001 (RRC-5/7). SDO further requested for closure of the case.

As per report of the SDO, the view point of the SDO is found to be in order and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 391/2009

Date of Institution:14.09.2009

Date of Decision : 25.11.2009

In the matter of

**Sh. Mohinder Singh S/o Sh. Ram Chander, Adarsh Colony,
Mohindergarh.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Mohinder Singh S/o Sh. Ram Chander R/o Adarsh Colony, Mohindergarh against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The representative of the SDO was present and submitted the reply stated therein that the bill of the petitioner to the satisfaction of the petitioner. The petitioner was present and stated that working of the meter may please be got checked and the bill be corrected accordingly.

The Nodal Officer was directed that a check meter be installed in parallel of existing meter and the result of the check meter be submitted on the next date of hearing.

To-day the representative of the SDO was present and submitted the results of the meter and a copy of the corrected bill, which was given to the petitioner. The petitioner stated that he is satisfied with the bill prepared by the SDO on the basis of the check meter report. The representative of the SDO was directed to remove the earlier defective meter and regularize the check meter.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 392/2009
Date of Institution: 14.09.2009
Date of Decision : 27.10.2009

In the matter of

Sh. Balwant Singh S/o Sh. Basant Singh, H.No.413, Sector-14, Faridabad.
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Balwant Singh S/o Sh. Basant Singh, Faridabad that the order of the District Consumer Forum is not being complied by the SDO. After going through the contents of the complaint and report of the Nodal Officer, this forum cannot adjudicate the case which is still pending in the other civil court/District Consumer Forum or the decision given by the other court/forum.

The case is hereby rejected from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

—

2009 **Case No.393/394/395 of**

Institution:22.09.2009 **Date** **of**

:09.06.2010 **Date** **of** **Decision**

In the matter of

Sh. Phool Kumar S/o Sh. Munshi Ram, Sh. Mukesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gopal Ram Sharma & Sh. Sumer Singh S/o Sh. Sube Singh R/o Balaji Nagar, Kaunt Road, Dadri Gate, Bhiwani.

V/s **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

Sh. Phool Kumar S/o Sh. Munshi Ram bearing petition No. 393/2009, Sh. Mukesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gopal Ram Sharma bearing petition No. 394/2009 & Sh. Sumer Singh S/o Sh. Sube Singh bearing petition No. 395/2009, residents of Balaji Nagar, Kaunt Road, Dadri Gate, Bhiwani of sub-urban Sub-Division No.2, DHBVN, Bhiwani under Op. Circle, DHBVN, Bhiwani had filed their petitions before this forum alleging therein that they & other 40-45 peoples have built their houses in Balaji colony, Bhiwani and are getting supply from Rural Feeder. But in the same colony, some connections have been connected with Urban Feeder.

They further stated that in the above said colony, their connections have been connected on the ballies, which are causing danger to their lives. During the wind storm or heavy rains, their supply remains off due to hanging of wires or blown off fuses or broken and fallen of ballies. No body is attending to their complaints promptly. Moreover, their lives are not safe because at any moment, any fatal /non fatal accident can be occurred due to broken of hanging wires on the earth/houses. Most of the consumers have already deposited in the name of development charges but nothing has been done by the Nigam in the name of improvement of LD system. They had already requested to the Nigam authorities from time to time to provide the poles in the colony and the supply of their residences/connections be connected with urban feeder as is done in other part of the colony so that they may live in a proper way of life and their children can study during day and night hours but nothing has been done so far.

Accordingly, their petitions were sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

; - 2 :-

The Nodal Officer submitted the reply, which was not in order and accordingly, this forum had ordered the Nodal Officer that either the connections where urban feeder supply have already been provided, be got disconnected or the connections of the petitioners be got connected with the same urban feeder by taking up the matter with the concerned SDO and Xen.

Earlier the SDO was denied that no connection had ever been released on urban feeder by his sub division, but later on , he confessed that about 25 No. connections had been released by his sub division i.e. S/urban Sub-Division No.2 and OP .Sub Division .Bhiwani in the jurisdiction of his sub division where the petitioners are residing nearby.

During the proceedings held on 5.4.2010, the SDO showed inability to connect the connections of petitioners from rural feeder to urban feeder but later on he agreed that he will connect the petitioners' connections with the same urban feeder by providing LD system in the area shortly.

To day, the SDO & the Nodal Officer were present and intimated vide his memo No. Ch-30/Forum-393/394/395/BWN dated 08.06.2010 stated therein that the compliance of the order has been made as all the connections of the petitioners have been connected with Urban Feeder and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.396/2009

Date of Institution:22.09.2009

Date of Decision :05.11.2009

In the matter of

Sh.Brij Mohan Gupta S/o Sh. Sohan Lal, Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri, Bhiwani.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta S/o Sh. Sohan Lal, Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri, Bhiwani against shifting of broken poles structure lying in front of his factory.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his viewpoint/reply. During the hearing, held on 05.11.2009, SDO submitted the reply of the petition stated therein that a three poles structure was broken during 8/2009 near the factory of the petitioner. A new three poles structure was erected at the same place and sagging of ACSR was done. The broken poles are lying near the road in the PWD land and are almost 30-40 feet away from the wall of the consumer. Due to these broken poles, the safeties of three poles are also increased. Moreover, these poles are not causing any problem to the petitioner. Hence, the consumer complaint is not genuine and may be dismissed.

Keeping in view the statement/reply of the SDO, the view of the SDO is in order, as the broken poles are lying in the land of PWD and is not causing any hindrance while coming and outgoing to the factory. The petition of the petitioner is hereby dismissed/rejected. The case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 397/2009

Date of Institution:05.10.2009

Date of Decision :05.11.2009

In the matter of
M/s Hari Har Pipe Industries, Sec-27-28, Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Sh. P.S. Saini, advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate of the petitioner against the wrong charges of Rs.48,212/- as sundry charges allowance in the bill of Sept., 2009 without any prior notice to his client and requested for the stay of the above said amount except the current payment of bill.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 05.11.2009, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the petition stated therein that the meter of the petitioner was defective and was changed during 11/2008 being defective vide MCO No. 6/316 dated 23.10.2008, which was effected on 26.10.2008. The bill of the petitioner was prepared on lesser side during that month and average charges of 3500 units were taken by the computer. During the checking by the Audit Party, a half margin No. 88/29 dated 01.08.2009 and Rs.48212/- were advised to be charged in account of the petitioner on the basis of consumption of the same month i.e. 11/2007 of the previous year.

Accordingly, a notice was served upon the petitioner to deposit the same because the supply of the petitioner never remained disconnected and remained continued even after information of defective of meter.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO, the view point of is found in order as the amount is rightly chargeable as pointed out by the Audit Party because the supply never disconnected and remained continued till the replacement of meter on the basis of the consumption of the month of last year. The petition of the petitioner is not found genuine; hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R. Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 398/2009
Date of Institution: 05.10.2009
Date of Decision : 05.11.2009

In the matter of
Sh. Dalip Singh S/o Sh. Bhali Ram, V&P.O. Khokha, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Dalip Singh S/o Sh. Bhali Ram, V&P.O. Khokha, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar against non-release of domestic connection.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his viewpoint/reply.

During proceedings held on 05.11.2009, the SDO submitted the reply stated therein that the petitioner where the connection is desired/required is a defaulter premises because a theft case had already been made and the petitioner has not cleared the defaulting amount till to-day. As per Sales Circular No. D-95/2001, it is clear mentioned that the new connection cannot be released until or unless the defaulting amount is not paid by the defaulter.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO and the Sales Circular, the plea of the SDO is found in order because as per instructions, the connection cannot be released at the defaulter premises. Hence, the case is closed from the forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 399/2009

Date of Institution:05.10.2009

Date of Decision :04.12.2009

In the matter of
Sh. Nanak Chand S/o Sh. Nand Lal, Gali No.24, Surya Nagar, Near Shiv Colony, Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Nanak Chand S/o Sh. Nand Lal, Gali No.24, Surya Nagar, Near Shiv Colony, Hisar through his counsel against the wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the hearing held on 05.11.2009, SDO was directed to get the bill corrected on the basis of the record and the same be submitted on the next date of hearing along with copy of sundry item so that the case is finalized accordingly.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted the details of refund granted/adjusted in the bill of the petitioner vide SC&AR No.318/8 and 319/8 and bill of the petitioner has been corrected accordingly. The supply of the petitioner restored vide RCO No. 3/96 dated 17.11.2009, effected on 20.11.2009. The respondent SDO stated that an acknowledgement in this regard has also been furnished by the petitioner.

Keeping in view the reply of the Nodal Officer and the acknowledgement from the petitioner, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 400/2009
Date of Institution:05.10.2009
Date of Decision : 27.01.2010

In the matter of

**M/s Primordial System Pvt. Ltd., P-81, EHPT, HERO HONDA CHOWK,
Sector-34, Gurgaon.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by M/s Primordial System Pvt. Ltd., P-81, EHPT, Hero Honda Chowk, Sector-34, Gurgaon against wrong billing and adjustment of already paid excess amount.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the hearing held on 25.11.2009, SDO submitted the reply, stated therein that the account of the petitioner has been overhauled for the period from 8/2008 to 11/09 and the excess amount charged Rs.42149/- has been adjusted in the bill of the consumer for the month of 12/2009 and the balance amount is payable by the consumer Rs.1,27,012/- upto 11/2009, which was not in order as per the petition. Accordingly, the SDO was directed to submit the details of the bills on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the representative of the SDO was present and submitted the details vide his memo No. 217 dated 27.01.2010 stated therein that the account of the consumer has been re-overhauled for the period 8/2008 to 1/2010 and the excess amount Rs.1,51,677/- is hereby credited in the bill of the petitioner for the month of 2/2009 and the balance amount payable by the petitioner is Rs.14268/- up to 1/2010.

Since the cause of action is over as per the petition, the case is hereby closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 401/2009
Date of Institution: 05.10.2009
Date of Decision : 25.11.2009

In the matter of

Ms Simi Madhok D/o Dr. K.L. Madhok, C-2-1278, Palam Vihar, Gurgaon.
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Ms Simi Madhok D/o Dr. K.L. Madhok, C-2/1278, Palam Vihar, Gurgaon against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings dated 27.10.2009, the Nodal Officer was directed to get the reply prepared along with copy of correct bill from the respondent SDO and the same be submitted on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No. Ch-5/Forum-401/GGN dated 24.11.2009 stated therein that the bills of the petitioner has been rectified as per the reading and the amount of surcharge for four months has been refunded/adjusted in the bill of the petitioner. After going through the reply and the copy of ledger, the version of the SDO is found to be in order and as per the instructions of the Nigam.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 402/2009
Date of Institution: 05.10.2009
Date of Decision :25.11.2009

In the matter of

Sh. Kamlesh Chandra, H.No.270, Sector-16, Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Kamlesh Chandra, R/o H.No.270, Sector-16, Faridabad against the compensation of the damaged/burnt of electric equipments due to high voltage.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 27.10.2009, the representative of the SDO was present and submitted the reply, which was not in order and he was directed to get the matter investigated from the nearby residents about the fluctuation/high voltage and the burning of equipments of the other consumers and submit the reply on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the representative of the SDO was present and submitted the reply and the evidence of neighbourers vide SDO/Op. S/Divn.(East), Old Faridabad memo No. Spl-1 dated 25.11.2009 stated therein that no complaint of high voltage/fluctuation has ever been reported by the neighbourers nor any electric equipments has ever been damaged/burnt due to high voltage/fluctuation during the period as reported by the petitioner in his petition.

Keeping in view the report of the SDO, as well as witness/statement of the neighbourers, the viewpoint of the SDO is in order and the claim of the petitioner is not justified and the same is hereby rejected/dismissed.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 403/2009
Date of Institution: 15.10.2009
Date of Decision : 04.12.2009

In the matter of
Sh. B.S.Sangwan, H.No.143, Housing Board Colony, Sirsa Road, Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh.Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. B.S.Sangwan, H.No.143, HBC, Sirsa Road, Hisar against the wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 05.11.2009, the representative of the SDO was present and he was directed that the bill of the petitioner be got set-right on the basis of the reading in the meter and the same be produced on the next date of hearing.

To-day the representative of the SDO was present and Nodal Officer submitted his reply vide memo No. Ch-6/Forum-403/HSR dated 04.12.2009 that the accounts of the petitioner has been overhauled and a sum of Rs.43451/- has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 569/30 and the petitioner has deposited the balance amount of his bill i.e. Rs.13257/- on 20.11.2009.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 404/2009
Date of Institution:16.10.2009
Date of Decision :04.12.2009

In the matter of
Sh. Hoshiar Singh S/o Sh. Shri Chand, Loharu Road, New India Coaching
School, Ward No.1, Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	None.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh.Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Hoshiar Singh S/o Sh. Shri Chand, Loharu Road, Ch.Dadri against the wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the reply through Nodal officer memo No. Ch-6/Forum-404/BWN dated 04.12.2009 stating therein that the premises of the subject cited consumer was checked by the Enforcement Staff and the meter found slow by 28.77% as per LL-1 No. 69/23 dated 19.05.2005. The difference of 2233 units was charged vide item No. 7/30 for Rs.9111/-. The above amount was again charged as per Half Margin of Internal Audit Party in the month of 7/09 and the said amount alongwith surcharge, amounting to Rs.10256/- has been reduced/adjusted in the energy bill of the consumer vide item No. SC&AR No. 07/04/102 dated 2.12.2009. Moreover, the meter of the petitioner has been replaced vide MCO No. 16/243 dated 8.8.09 and average charge of 400units during 5/09 has been adjusted during the billing for the month of 7/09. Now the balance amount of the energy bill is Rs.13155/- (Rs.23411-10256) is payable by the petitioner which will be reflected in the next bill of the petitioner.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 405/2009
Date of Institution:23.10.2009
Date of Decision :05.11.2009

In the matter of
Smt. Saroj Devi W/o Sh. Pawan Kumar, M/s Shiv Shakti Wire Industry,
Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh.Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Saroj Devi W/o Sh. Pawan Kumar, M/s Shiv Shakti Wire Industry, Hisar through her counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate against wrong charges.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 05.11.2009, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply stated therein that the grievance of the petitioner has been settled and the petitioner is satisfied and requested for the closure of the case. The counsel of the petitioner was also present and he was also of the same view as explained by the Nodal Officer/SDO.

Keeping in view the statements of both the parties, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Since, the cause of action is over; hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 406/2009
Date of Institution:26.10.2009
Date of Decision :19.05.2010

In the matter of

**Sh. R.C. Jaiswal, Principal, Oriental Staff Training College, Sector-11,
Bata Mor, Mathura Road, Faridabad.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. R.C. Jaiswal, Principal, Oriental Staff Training College, Sector-11, Bata Mor, Mathura Road, Faridabad against non-clubbing of load and extension of load from 91 KW and 199.4 KW to 408 KW with CD 326 KVA inspite of depositing the entire estimated cost along with inspection fee as per demand notice.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 25.11.2009, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of SDO/Op. S/Divn.(East), DHBVN, Old Faridabad vide his memo No. 1294 dated 19.11.2009 stated therein that the petitioner applied for the extension of load from 91 KW & 199.4 KW to 408 KW with CD 326 KVA vide application and agreement No. 7488/LS dated 11.7.2007. The load was sanctioned by XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Old Faridabad vide his memo No. Ch-4/Op.1221/East dated 6.11.2008 subject to installation of additional power T/F at 66KV S/Stn. Escort-II or up gradation of 33KV S/Stn. Escort-I to 66KV level and shifting the load of Sector-20-B feeder to 66KV S/Stn. Escort-I. But neither the additional T/F has been installed at 66KV Escort-II nor the load of 11KV Sector-20-B feeder shifted to 66KV Escort-I as the second power T/F has not been installed by XEN, HVPN, Faridabad so far.

-: 2 :-

The petitioner was present and stated that when the load was not available with the Sub-Division, why the demand notice was issued for complying of the demand notice and depositing the cost of the estimate amounting to Rs.651050/-. Moreover, they have constructed the infrastructure after complying of the demand notice of the respondent SDO and a huge amount of Rs.25.00 lacs has been expended on the system. Being an Undertaking Organization of Govt. of India, a huge loss is being incurred on the investment and loss is being sustained due to non-release of the extension of load.

The Nodal Officer was present and he was directed to get the matter investigated from the concerned XEN/SDO and the matter be brought in the knowledge of the management for non extension of the load and the loss is being sustained by the petitioner. When the load was not available, why the demand notice was issued to the petitioner for compliance? After hearing both the parties, this Forum had ordered the respondent SDO, XEN and S.E. that this Forum has taken a very serious view as the consumer is being harassed by the officer of the Nigam in non-releasing the desired load on one pretext or the other, even after depositing the estimated cost and completion of other formalities. The SDO was directed to get the load released to the petitioner by taking up the matter with the concerned officers of HVPN as well as of DHBVN.

During the proceedings held on 19.05.2010, the respondent SDO submitted that the desired load of the petitioner has been released and requested for closer of the case. The petitioner was also present and he was also agreed with the views of the SDO and has acknowledged a letter of having been redressed his grievances and also thanked the Forum for getting the grievances redressed by taking up the matter with the officer of the Nigam.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel))
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 407/2009
Date of Institution: 05.11.2009
Date of Decision : 05.04.2010

In the matter of
**Sh. Satish Kumar Kaushik, President, M/s New Shri Anandpur Stone
Crusher, Gram Udyog Mandal, Khanak, Tehsil, Tosham, Distt., Bhiwani.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Satish Kumar Kaushik, President, M/s New Shri Anandpur Stone Crusher, Gram Udyog Mandal, Khanak, through his counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate against the average amount of Rs.2,76,548/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. SDO submitted the reply stated therein that due to the slowness of meter of the petitioner by 66.67%, the Audit Party advised the SDO to charge the petitioner for the slowness of meter for the period 8/2006 to 9/2006. The SDO charged the amount Rs.2,76,548/-, which was not correct. This Forum ordered the SDO respondent to charge the correct amount. The SDO respondent reviewed the amount of slowness of meter and the exact chargeable amount of slowness of meter for the period 8/2006 to 9/2006 is comes to Rs.45475/-.

SDO felt sorry for the amount charged wrongly in the first instance and the petitioner was informed through the notice. Since the bill of the petitioner has been corrected/overhauled and the balance amount of Rs.45475/- is rightly chargeable, as per contention of the SDO.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 408/2009

Date of Institution:06.12.2009

Date of Decision :05.04.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Om Parkash S/o Sh. Jiwan Dass, R/o Lachman Chotra, Hansi, Distt., Hisar.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh.Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Om Parkash S/o Sh. Jiwan Dass, R/o Lachman Chotra, Hansi, Distt., Hisar through his counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate against the amount of arrear Rs.2,59,340/- for which the case had been decided by the District Consumer Forum in his client favour but the decision is not being implemented and the impugned amount is being added with the current bill. Moreover, an average bill had been issued by the SDO, which is wrong.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The SDO stated in his reply that during the period from 7/2008 to 1/2009 and up to 23.1.2009, the reading in the meter was not visible and during this period the MMC @ Rs.960/- plus Rs.20/- as meter rent were charged. Thereafter, the meter was replaced and the reading of old meter was taken and the reading of new meter was also taken. After comparing the reading, the amount charged on account of MMC during the defective period, the amount was overhauled and the bill of the petitioner was corrected after adjustment of the excess amount of Rs. 6491.48 + 297 as interest = Rs.6788/- vide SC&AR No. 147/144 dated 28.10.2009, charged on account of MMC. Now after adjustment of above excess amount, Rs.3435/- is still stands toward the Nigam after deduction of the current energy bill up to 3/2010 and the same shall be adjusted in the future electricity bills of the petitioner.

On the other hand the counsel of the petitioner stated that no sundry item has been mentioned in the above referred letter. No proper reply has been furnished by the SDO. No MCO was supplied where the reading was taken while replacement of the meter. No signature of the consumer has been taken on the MCO.

:- 2 :-

The SDO submitted the copy of MCO and shown the signature of the petitioner, which was appended on the MCO and a copy of the same was shown & supplied to the counsel of the petitioner. So far as the other charges levelled by the counsel of petitioner against the SDO regarding non-supply of sundry item etc. was not found in order as the sundry item has been mentioned by the SDO in his reply, which has been referred above. Regarding the other charges of mentioning the impugned amount of Rs. 2,59,340/-, the same has not been mentioned in the bill and a copy of proof of filed a petition against the order of the District Consumer Forum with the State Commission has also been furnished by the SDO, which is in the record and the next date is fixed as 12.4.2011 before the Hon'ble State Commission for final argument.

Keeping in view the arguments and the documents supplied before the Forum by the SDO, the contention of the SDO is found in order as the amount is rightly charged and adjusted as per the documents and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 409/2009
Date of Institution:08.12.2009
Date of Decision: 27.01.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Anuj Tandon, 16 SF/III, Eroj Garden, Charmwood Village, Faridabad.
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Anuj Tandon, 16 SF/III, Eroj Garden, Charmwood Village, Faridabad against the average billing being made to him.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No. Ch-6/Forum-409/Faridabad dated 25.01.2010 stating therein that the meter of the petitioner was replaced during 5/2007, the account of the consumer was charged on average billing 2/2008 to till-date being the MCO was not received by the concerned JE/Field even after repeated letters to him.

Keeping in view the record of the petitioner, an amount of Rs.15891/- is outstanding against the consumer. Now the account of the petitioner has been overhauled by the SDO vide SC&AR No. 132/R-44 and an amount of Rs.28286/- has been refunded to the petitioner in his account, which shall be reflected in his next electricity bill to be issued in 2/2010.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 410/2009

Date of Institution:08.12.2009

Date of Decision :27.01.2010

In the matter of

Sh. S.K.Kejriwal, M/s Supra Enterprise, Plot No.39, Sector-27A, Mathura Road, Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. S.K.Kejriwal, M/s Supra Enterprise, Plot No.39, Sector-27A, Mathura Road, Faridabad stated therein that he had given his factory on rent and was got vacated in the end of November, 2009 and he immediately filed a request in the office of DHBVN for charging the MMC instead of average being no use of load. The amount of Rs.7500/- as MMC were paid till July, 2009. Thereafter, the Nigam has started for raising the bill for more than the MMC.

The petitioner further stated in the petition that his factory is lying closed and no consumption of electricity is being used. Their connection has also been disconnected by the Nigam.

Accordingly,the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. During the hearing held on 16.12.2009, SDO was present and submitted the reply stating therein that the premises of the petitioner was got checked from the concerned JE and he submitted the report stating therein that the premises of the petitioner is lying vacant. The SDO further stated orally that the petitioner had taken two number connections in the same premises and the one connection was got disconnected due to non-payment and the existing 2nd connection where the petition is being heard was also disconnected due to non-payment of the electricity bills. The account of the petitioner where the average has been charged can be overhauled and the supply shall be restored, if the petitioner is ready to make the payment of the defaulting amount of another disconnected connection which had been taken in the same premises.

-: 2 :-

The representative of the petitioner was present the date of hearing and stated that he has no knowledge of the status of the previous connection and the position of the same can be explained on the next date of hearing. He was allowed to explain his view point on the next date of hearing. SDO was directed to get the record of the petitioner checked-up and, if any detail is made available by the petitioner in support of another connection, which had already been disconnected by the Nigam due to non-payment, then the action be taken accordingly and report of the same be furnished on the next date of hearing.

To day, the SDO was present but the petitioner or his rep was not present. SDO further submitted the detailed report that the PDCO bearing No. 56/190 was got issued on 31.12.2008 to remove the meter on the request of the consumer. The meter of the consumer could not be removed due to wrong account number mentioned by the consumer i.e. 2741-0043 instead of 2741-0048. The matter was got investigated by the SDO and later on PDCO No. 2/232 was got issued to regularize the case. The meter was got removed on the above said PDCO on dated 12.11.2009, the consumer was billed on MMC basis from 12/2008 to 12/2009 at the rate of Rs.7350/- per month.

Keeping in view the report of SDO and the statement made by the petitioner, this forum concluded that the viewpoint of the SDO is found in order. SDO directed to take action after receipt of the defaulting amount of the defaulting premises in the name of the petitioner as per standing instructions of the Nigam. The case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 411/2009
Date of Institution: 10.12.2009
Date of Decision : 16.12.2009

In the matter of

Dr. V.D. Sharma, 172/5, Urban Estate, Karnal-132001.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Dr. V.D.Sharma S/o Late Sh. M.P.Joshi, r/o Karnal against the wrong/illegal charges of meter cost which was paid by the petitioner while taken the connection at his residence at Flat No.205, GHS-25, Sector-56, Gurgaon bearing A/C No.RD03/2524.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point. During the proceeding held on 16.12.09, the Nodal Officer stated that the petition of the petitioner is not falls under the jurisdiction of the Forum and requested for rejection of the same. The petitioner was also present and he was also convinced by the Nodal Officer and the petitioner agreed for with-drawl of the same. Since the petitioner has withdrawn his case, the case is hereby closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 412/2009
Date of Institution: 28.12.2009
Date of Decision : 27.01.2010

In the matter of

Sh.Om Parkash, Officer-Incharge, ECHS, Poly Clinic, Plot No.1, Employees Colony, Narnaul.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Om Parkash, Officer-Incharge, ECHS, Poly Clinic, Plot No.1, Employees Colony, Faridabad against imposing the amount of Rs.13363/- on behest of the audit report which had already been refunded to him.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The SDO submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide memo No. Ch-5/Forum-412/NNL dated 25.01.2010 stating therein that the NDS connection of the consumer was released on 18.11.2005. The first bill was issued in the month of 2/2007. The bill was based on average for 2100 Kwh. The meter of the consumer was defective and billing was done on average up to 5/2007. The defective meter was replaced vide MCO No. 21/3100 dated 13.5.2007. From 18.11.2005 to 5/2007 i.e. for 18 months, the total average billed is 7000Kwh. The average energy consumption of the consumer from 5/2007 to-date is in the range of 580-600 Kwh per month, which is much more than the average already charged from 11/2005 to 5/2007.

SDO further stated that the consumer was erroneously allowed a refund of Rs.13363/- in 7/2007. The audit party got charged the un-duly refunded amount vide half margin No. 4/43 dated 28.5.2009. The consumer was billed for excess by (1161 Kwh) Rs.5606/- which has already been credited in the account of the consumer in the month of 9/2009.

-: 2 :-

The petitioner was present and stated that why & how the amount has been charged by the SDO when the same amount had already been refunded to him, which is wrong and should be waived off. The SDO was asked as to how the amount had been charged and refunded. The details of the same be intimated. The SDO was present and stated that he has no details of the amount charged and refunded by the then CA/Official of the Nigam and he cannot prove this.

Keeping in view the statement of the SDO, this forum ordered the SDO when you have no details of amount charged/refunded and then there is no idea to charge the illegal amount from the petitioner without any authentic proof. The matter be investigated and the amount so charged from the petitioner be placed in the misc. advances of the then erring official/s who had charged and later on allowed the refund. The amount so charged from the petitioner illegally and without any authentic proof, be refunded and report compliance to the Nodal Officer. The SDO is further directed to take action on the remaining part of his petition/issue of the petitioner, if he complies with the instructions of the Nigam.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 413/2010
Date of Institution: 18.01.2010
Date of Decision :31.03.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Anil Shahi S/o Late Sh. Ramesh Chander Shahi, 228, 2nd Floor,
Sector-34, Ashok Enclave-1, Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. A.S.Jaiswal, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Anil Shahi S/o Late Sh. Ramesh Chander Shahi, 228, 2nd Floor, Sector-34, Ashok Enclave-1, Faridabad against the running of fast meter and correction of billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 27.01.2010, the Nodal Officer stated that the defective meter of the petitioner was replaced vide MCO No. 65/698 dated 6.6.2008. The bill of the consumer was issued on the basis of consumption recorded by the meter. The consumer meter was again defective and the same was replaced vide MCO No.46/138 dated 4.3.2009. The billing has been done to the petitioner on the basis of reading recorded in the meter.

The SDO was directed that the meter of the petitioner be got checked from M&P in the presence of the petitioner and report be complied on the next date of hearing. To-day the SDO submitted the report through the Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Ch-11/Forum-413/FBD dated 30.03.2010 stated therein that as per the proceedings of the Forum, the meter of the consumer was got checked from the M&P lab in the presence of the consumer and the accuracy of the meter found within limit. The consumer has also agreed with the checking report and has made the payment of one installment of the total bill, as allowed by the SDO.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 414/2010
Date of Institution: 18.01.2010
Date of Decision: 27.01.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Shashi Pal Sharma, H.No. 745, Sector-8, Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Shashi Pal Sharma, H.No.745, Sector-8, Faridabad against non-replacement of defective meter even after deposited the cost of meter and billing on average basis.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. To-day the SDO was present and stated that the meter of the petitioner has been replaced on 21.01.2010 and the same report has also been confirmed by the petitioner on telephone. So far as the average billing is concerned, being made to him, the SDO was directed to get the bill of the petitioner corrected after receipt of the reading recorded in the three cycle months billing.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.415/2010
Date of Institution: 22.01.2010
Date of Decision : 05.03.2010

In the matter of

Smt. Shakuntla Devi W/o Sh. Jai Singh, C/o M/s J.S.Glass Industries, Delhi Road, Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Shakuntla Devi W/o Sh. Jai Singh, C/o M/s J.S.Glass Industries, Delhi Road, Ch.Dadri, bearing A/c No. R/W-41-0031, against non-disconnection of electricity temporarily from his premises, damaged due to heavy wind storm for which he had applied for TDCO during the month of 10/2009 and charging an average billing.

According to the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No. Ch-9/Forum-415/BWN dated 05.03.2010 stating therein that the consumer has given a request on 01.01.2010 for granting the TDCO facility w.e.f. 01.11.2009 to 31.05.2010, which is not possible in view of Sales Instruction No. 46/2006. The SDO has submitted the case to the Division office after attending the observations for granting the TDCO facility. Now XEN/Op. Division, Ch.Dadri had approved the TDCO w.e.f. 01.03.2010 to 31.08.2010 vide his memo No. 12166 dated 01.03.2010 subject to conditions mentioned in the reply. The SDO has further stated that the TDCO has been issued vide SJO No. 95/201 dated 04.03.2010 with reading 75012.

After considering the reply of the Nodal Officer, this forum had ordered to charge the petitioner for one month MMC only and the consumer be given proper notice to complete his construction work of his premises within the time schedule given to him by the XEN, i.e. latest by 31.08.2010. The petitioner was present and he was also agreed with the decision of the forum and given an undertaking in this regard. Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.416/2010
Date of Institution:25.01.2010
Date of Decision : 05.03.2010

In the matter of

Smt. Sumitra Devi W/o Sh. Telu Ram Jangra, V&P.O. Prem Nagar, Kali Devi Road, Hansi, Distt., Hisar.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	None.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Sumitra Devi W/o Sh. Telu Ram Jangra, V&P.O. Prem Nagar, Kali Devi Road, Hansi through her counsel Sh. P.K.Jangra, Advocate against non-release of connection at her premises.

The petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The SDO submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide his memo No.Ch-4/Forum-416/HSR dated 05.02.2010 stated therein that he has visited the site where the petitioner has requested for release of connection. He further stated that this premises is a defaulting premises where two number electricity connections were running earlier in the name of Smt. Jai Devi, A/C No. MT-1249/DS and another NDS connection in the name of Sh. Jagdish S/o Sh. Jai Kishan, A/C No. MT-1541/NDS. Both the connections were removed due to non-depositing of defaulting amount i.e. Rs.55913/- and Rs.12196/- respectively. As per Sales Circular of Nigam, the connection cannot be released at the defaulting premises.

Keeping in view the Sales Circular, the contention of the SDO/Nodal Officer is found to be in order and the connection cannot be released at the defaulter premises. Hence the case is hereby rejected/closed.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

29.01.2010

Case No.417/2010
Date of Institution:

Date of Decision :05.02.2010

In the matter of
Smt. Darshna Devi W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar, H.No.1263/7, Mahabir
Colony, Chandni Chowk, Hisar.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Darshna Devi W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar, H.No.1263/7, Mahabir Colony, Chandni Chowk, Hisar against allowing her part payments of tentative defaulting amount Rs.55000/- in twelve equal installments and reconnection of her Atta Chaki Connection, which was disconnected due to non-payment of energy bills of the Atta Chaki connection for the last eight months.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

SDO was present and submitted his reply through Nodal Officer stating therein that during the month of 10/2009, the consumer has requested him to accept Rs.30000/- and accordingly she had given a check of Rs.30000/- out of the total defaulting amount Rs.62645/-, which was bounced due to non-balance of amount in her account. The consumer was again requested to deposit the defaulting amount other-wise her connection shall be disconnected. But the consumer did not deposit any amount and the connection of the petitioner had been disconnected vide PDCO No. 96/306 dated 21.01.2010.

The petitioner was present before the forum and requested that she is a poor lady & belongs to BPL category and cannot pay the lump-sum defaulting amount and she may be allowed for reconnection of her Atta Chaki connection and 12 No. equal installments of the defaulting amount along with the current bill, as she has no other source of income.

-: 2 :-

The SDO was present and he was asked as to how this huge amount had been accumulated and why the connection had not been disconnected on the first or second default. Due to failure in performing of official duties by the SDO/staff, this forum is allowing the relief to the petitioner to make the payment of huge defaulting amount in three equal installments along with current payment of energy bill, keeping in view the circumstances explained by the petitioner before the forum. The responsibility may also be fixed against the erring official for accumulating huge defaulting amount.

That due to non-action taken by the Nigam well in time, this forum is hereby ordered that, if the petitioner is ready to make the payment in three equal installments along with payment of current bill by given an undertaking on Non-Judicial Stamp Paper worth Rs.10/-, with witness, then her connection be reconnected. The case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 418/2010
Date of Institution:09.02.2010
Date of Decision :31.03.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Teji S/o Late Sh. Mangal, V&P.O. Bahin, Tehsil, Hathin, Distt., Palwal.
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. A.S.Jaiswal, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Teji S/o Late Sh. Mangal, V&PO. Bahin, Tehsil, Hathin, Distt., Palwal against the wrong penalty imposed for the load of a motor by the Nigam while checking the meter at site.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

After going through the history of the case, the case of the consumer for un-authorized load at the premises was detected during the year 2007 along with two other consumers on the same LL-1 and the penalty was imposed upon the consumers as per checking report/load. After submission of the notice to the consumer for depositing the penalty amount, the petitioner has not made any payment of bill from the date of checking i.e. 2007 till date, and the premises of the petitioner is still running.

SDO was present & he was directed to go through the case carefully and submit the action taken report on the next date of hearing.

To-day the representative of the SDO was present and submitted the detailed action taken report along with the consent of the petitioner of having been redressed his grievances. The petitioner was also present and stated that his grievances has been redressed and now he has no grievance regarding the billing.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.419/2010
Date of Institution:15.02.2010
Date of Decision :05.04.2010

In the matter of

**Sh. Naresh Kumar Mittal S/o Sh. Sudhan Lal Mittal, Mittal Confectionary,
G.S.Jain Marg, Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition has been filed by Sh. Naresh Kumar Mittal S/o Sh. Sudhan Lal Mittal, R/o of Ch.Dadri against imposing the penalty for slowness of meter for one year instead of 6 months.

During the proceedings held on 5.03.2010, the SDO has submitted the reply of the petition which was sent by the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-419/BWN dated 05.03.2010 stated therein that the meter of the consumer was checked vide LL-1 No. 37/97 dated 15.11.2008 and the meter was found slow by 69.52%. The consumer has been charged an amount of Rs.20475/- vide SC&AR No. 3/457 for difference for one year as pointed out by the Audit Firm.

After review the reply of the SDO and the statement of the petitioner, this Forum observed some deficiency in the checking report and ordered to replace the defective meter and charged the amount only for six months for the slowness of meter instead of one year.

Accordingly, during the proceedings held on 05.04.2010, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No. Ch-8/Forum-419/BWN dated 05.04.2010, stated therein that the reason for not replacing the defective meter as pointed out by the JE in the LL-1 proforma, while checking the meter at site and the concerned JE was bound to replace the meter after declaring the defect-ness in the meter. Now the defective meter of the petitioner has been replaced and the amount of average of slowness meter has been charged for six months instead of one year.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.420/2010

Date of Institution:26.02.2010

Date of Decision :05.04.2010

In the matter of

**Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Sh. Ishwar Singh, Ward No.15, Jhajjar Ghati,
Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Laxmi Devi W/o Sh. Ishwar Singh, r/o Ch.Dadri against imposing an average billing since 2002 i.e. after affecting the PDCO and removal of meter from the site and a total approximate bill of rupees two lacs has been shown as pending till date.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

SDO submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-420/BWN dated 05.04.2010 stated therein that the consumer was a defaulter for Rs.955/- in the month of 2/2002, up to this period the billing has been done for the consumption recorded by the meter. From 4/2002 to up till now, the billing was done on average basis (S) code (Meter not at site). SDO further stated that the meter of the consumer might have been removed after Feb., 2002 but due to non-entry of PDCO, the billing has been continued and has withdrawn the amount of fictitious billing from 4/2002 to date. However, the consumer is liable to pay Rs.955/- along with surcharge thereupon, the breakup of the amount payable by the consumer is as under:

Principle Amount	Rs.955/-
Surcharge	Rs.5965/-
Total	Rs.6920/-

On the other side, the petitioner was present and stated that why the bill has been issued after affecting the PDCO and removal of the meter from the site. He further stated that before affecting the PDCO, no meter can be removed from the site.

-: 2 :-

After hearing both the parties, it is concluded that the action taken by the Nigam, by issuing fictitious billing even after affecting of PDCO and removal of meter, is against the instructions of HERC/Nigam. It is ordered that a charge sheet be issued to the concerned SDO/JE In-charge of the area for harassing the petitioner by issuing the fictitious bills.

It is further ordered that Rs.955/- only is chargeable from the petitioner with surcharge of six months only. The petitioner was present and he was also agreed with the above order of the Forum. Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.421/2010

Date of institution :05.03.2010

Date of Decision :05.05.2010

In the matter of

**Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gharsi Ram, H.No.299, Mahabir Colony,
Chandni Chowk, Hisar.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gharsi Ram, r/o Hisar against the non-deposit of money deposited by him against his connection bearing A/C No. HH11/1315 and charging the DS connection into NDS connection charges

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 05.04.2010, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide memo No.5474 dated 5.4.2010 stated therein that the consumer had deposited Rs.14,000/- in the month of December, 2007, Rs.4,000/- in the month of February, 2008 & Rs.4,000/- in the month of February, 2008. After February, 2008, the above consumer has not deposited even a single penny to DHBVN & claimed that the above amount was not debited in the account of above consumer. The DS connection of the consumer was converted to NDS category in 11/2005 and a amount of Rs.5677/- was posted through Sundry No.99/35/4 in the account of consumer. After that the account of the consumer was running in NDS category.

During the proceedings held on 5.04.2010, this forum directed the SDO to visit the site and to check whether the load of NDS category is running on DS connection or not and report be complied on the next date of hearing i.e. fixed for 05.05.2010. Accordingly, the SDO has submitted his report through Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar memo No. Ch-7/Forum-421/HSR dated 04.05.2010 stating therein that the premises of the consumer was visited by the SDO for verification of the same and it has been found that the above meter was installed in the commercial area (behind the shop of Atta Chakki). In that commercial area welding set and other commercial instruments were found. For the Atta Chakki, a separate meter was installed previously but the same was disconnected due to defaulting amount and the consumer has not submitted any Affidavit with a guarantor and also not deposited any amount as per decision of the Forum in that case.

The SDO has further intimated that the lights and weighing machine of Atta Chakki/Shop was running on the DS connection. The rooms made on the back yard of the shop and the commercial area was also running on the DS connection.

After hearing both the parties, it is ordered that the account of the consumer be overhauled and the consumer be charged for DS tariff right from prior to the date of disconnection of his Atta Chakki, which was disconnected due to non-payments of the bills and the consumer is using his Atta Chakki through the DS connection and thereafter the NDS charges be levied. The contention of the SDO is found in order and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 422/2010

Date of Institution:15.03.2010

Date of Decision :19.05.2010

In the matter of

Sh. S.S.Kuthiala, H.No.443, Sector-40, Gurgaon..

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. S.S.Kuthiala, r/o Gurgaon on 15.03.2010 regarding average billing amounting to Rs.33400/- on account of slowness of meter by 57.77% and further stated that no checking had ever been done of his electricity meter in his presence by any Agency nor any notice of charging the penalty amount on account of slowness of meter had ever been received from the SDO before charging the amount. Moreover, the meter has not been replaced till date and the billing is being done on the basis of reading recording by the existing meter.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 31.03.2010, the SDO/CCC, S/City S/Divn., Kanhai, Gurgaon was present and stated that the amount has been charged by the Audit on account of slowness of meter of the petitioner by 57.77%, as per checking done by Data Zen Agency engaged by the Nigam. The SDO was asked as to why the penalty of slowness of meter has been imposed after two years where no checking had ever been done as per version of the petitioner. When the checking at the petitioner's premises had not been done, why the amount has been imposed upon the petitioner? Further more, the meter of the petitioner has also not been replaced. w.e.f. the date of checking, till the date of charging the amount from the petitioner.

After hearing the SDO and the petitioner, this Forum directed the SDO to get the meter checked up from the M&P in the presence of the petitioner and submit the status report on the next date of hearing.

-: 2 :-

To day a representative of the SDO was present and stated that the meter of the petitioner has been got checked up from the M&P and the meter has been found slow by 33% instead of 57.77% as earlier checked by the checking agency. Accordingly, the bill of the petitioner has been overhauled on the basis of the new checking done in the presence of the petitioner by the M&P Wing. An amount of Rs. 20190/- has been deducted from the original bill of the petitioner. Since, the petitioner was not present and he was contacted on telephone and he was also satisfied with the checking done. The SDO is directed to recover the amount of slowness of meter in three equal installments along with the current bill from the petitioner, as he had requested that he is not in a position to deposit the amount in one installment.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 423/2010
Date of Institution: 17.03.2010
Date of Decision : 21.04.2010.

In the matter of

**Sh.Sohan Singh C/o Classic Saree, Shop No.3, 1st Floor, Yasin Plaza,
Sadar Bazar, Gurgaon.**

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Not Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Sohan Singh r/o Gurgaon regarding replacement of faulty meter and refund of the already charged excess amount.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 31.03.2010, the SDO was present and submitted the reply which was not in order. He was directed to look in the complaint/petition of the petitioner carefully and set right the same and report compliance on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the SDO was not present but send a letter through the bearer of his office stating therein that the meter of the petitioner has been changed and also the bill rectified vide SC&AR No. 238-41 dated 04.04.2010 and the petitioner is satisfied.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO, the cause of action is over and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 424/2010
Date of Institution:22.03.2010
Date of Decision :19.05.2010

In the matter of

Sh. K.K.Kapoor, H.No.217, Sector-28, Faridabad.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Not Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. K.K.Kapoor, H.No.217, Sector-28, Faridabad against the excess billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 31.3.2010, the SDO submitted the reply stated therein that the meter of the petitioner was become defective and was replaced during 2008. On the basis of the reading of new meter, the bill of the petitioner was overhauled for the period 11/2007 to 5.2008. The copy of the reply was handed over to the petitioner. The petitioner protested that why the corresponding period has been taken as base for charging the amount. The petitioner stated that the base should be taken for the period 2006/2007, when the meter was working O.K. i.e. prior to become defective. In this way, the difference of units comes out to 200 units only.

The Nodal Officer was also present and he was directed to look into the statement of petitioner for charging the amounts and report be submitted on the next date.

To-day the SDO was present and stated that the Nigam has no problem in calculating the difference of units as desired by the petitioner and the bill of the meter shall be got rectified by taking the base of 2006/2007 i.e. prior to the year of defective period. The petitioner was present and he was asked to contact the office of the SDO and the rectified bill be obtained from his office.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.425/2010

Date of Institution:25.03.2010

Date of Decision : 05.05.2010

In the matter of

Sh.Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri, Bhiwani.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

The SDO was present and submitted the detailed reply of the petition. The petitioner raised some points in his petition for which the SDO attended the points, which were possible and as per the Nigam Instructions/Sales Circulars, because petitioner inter-mingled his grievances in his petition & is not attending the Forum for arguments and most of the grievances had already been heard and redressed in his previous petitions. Moreover, the petitioner had also gone in the office of Ombudsman, HERC, Panchkula. SDO is further directed to intimate the petitioner along with copy of reply and copy of ledger etc. regarding redressal of his grievances raised in the petition.

Since, the petitioner is not attending the Forum so the reply of the SDO is considered as correct/in order. Since the cause of action is over and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.426/2010

Date of Institution: 25.03.2010

Date of Decision :05.05.2010

In the matter of

**Smt. Sarla Rani W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri,
Bhiwani.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

The SDO was present and submitted the detailed reply of the petition. The petitioner raised some points in his petition for which the SDO attended the points, which were possible and as per the Nigam Instructions/Sales Circulars, because petitioner inter-mingled his grievances in his petition & is not attending the Forum for arguments and most of the grievances had already been heard and redressed in his previous petitions. Moreover, the petitioner had also gone in the office of Ombudsman, HERC, Panchkula. SDO is further directed to intimate the petitioner along with copy of reply and copy of ledger etc. regarding redressal of his grievances raised in the petition.

Since, the petitioner is not attending the Forum so the reply of the SDO is considered as correct/in order. Since the cause of action is over and there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.427/2010

Date of Institution:25.03.2010

Date of Decision :05.05.2010

In the matter of

Smt. Sarla Rani W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road, Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Smt. Sarla Rani W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, r/o Ch.Dadri against change of defective meter, correct billing and the interest on ACD deposited by him.

The petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The SDO submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Ch-6/Forum-427/BWN dated 05.05.2010, stating therein that the petitioner has refused to change his electricity meter of A/C No. RRC-442 and given an application that the meter is O.K. and the reading of the meter is wrong as alleged by the petitioner during the month of April, 2010, the reading has been shown as 1000 units. When the matter was investigated from the HESL Personnel and he intimated that the reading was taken after checking of the meter and the same is correct.

Regarding the issue of interest on ACD, an amount of Rs.343/- becomes due and the same has been credited in the consumer account vide SC&AR No. 39/105R dated 30.04.2010. The copy of the ledger has also supplied by the SDO along with the reply. After hearing the reply of the SDO, most of his genuine grievances have been redressed. Since the petitioner is not coming forward before the Forum for any cross examination, the reply of the SDO is considered as in order. The SDO is directed to supply a copy of documents, which has been furnished by him before the Forum, to the petitioner for his knowledge and ready reference.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.428/2010

Date of Institution: 25.03.2010

Date of Decision :05.05.2010

In the matter of

**Sh. Shashi Kumar Gupta S/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, Rohtak Road,
Ch.Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Shashi Kumar Gupta W/o Sh. Brij Mohan Gupta, r/o Ch.Dadri against shifting of overhead line passing over the premises of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer vide memo No. Ch-6/Forum-428/BWN dated 05.05.2010 stating therein that the premises was checked by the SDO along with JE. It has been observed that there will be difficulty in shifting of wire. However, an estimate has been prepared for Rs.1,39,543/- for the cost of shifting. If, the consumer is ready to deposit the said cost, the overhead line will be shifted.

After gone through the reply of the SDO, the SDO is directed to intimate the petitioner for deposit of the charges of shifting, prepared by him, as the petitioner is not coming forward before the forum. If, the petitioner is ready to deposit the shifting cost as per Nigam Instructions, then the shifting be done immediately and report compliance. It is for the petitioner to deposit the cost or not for shifting of the line; there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No.429/2010

Date of Institution:26.03.2010

Date of Decision :05.05.2010

In the matter of

**Sh. S.P.Gupta S/o Sh. Mani Ram, H.No.81, Old Model Town, Tohana,
Distt., Fatehabad.**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition has been filed by Sh.S.P. Gupta ,resident of Tohana, stated therein that although the meter was provided/supplied by him while changing the defective meter at his premises but the Nigam is charging the meter rent since the date of change of meter.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. The Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar has submitted the reply vide his memo No.Ch.6/Forum-429/HSR dated 4.5.2010, stating therein that the meter of the petitioner was changed vide MCO No.6/2109 dated 11.8.2006 and the same was supplied by the petitioner. Inadvertently, the Nigam has started to charge the meter rent from September-2006 and now the amount of the same meter rent has been adjusted/credited in the petitioner's account vide sundry item no.4/4/87 and requested for closer of the case.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 430/2010
Date of Institution:25.03.2010
Date of Decision :19.05.2010

In the matter of

Sh. R.Govinda Rajan, B-1414, Green Field Colony, Sector-42, Near Gate No. 8, T-point , Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh.R.Govinda Rajan, resident of Faridabad regarding adjustment of his temporary connection security into regular connection bills and correction of bill against wrong reading.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. During the proceedings held on 21.04.2010, this forum ordered the Nodal Officer to get the bill rectified from the concerned SDO along with the adjustment of his ACD and report compliance on the next date.

To day, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No. Ch-7/Forum-430/FBD dated 18.05.2010 stating therein that the Meter Reader has recorded the wrong reading as 2245 instead of 1245 units for the month of 1/2010. The premises of the consumer was checked by Sh. Inder Sharma, JE(F) and reported that the working of the meter is O.K. and reading verified for 1500 units. Accordingly, the bill of the consumer has been corrected vide SC&AR No. 5/48. The ACD of the consumer for Rs.4000/- is also adjusted in his next billing cycle. The consumer has also acknowledged that he is fully satisfied with the action taken report.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 431/2010
Date of Institution: 23.04.2010
Date of Decision : 19.05.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Davender Kumar S/o Sh. Lalu Ram Garg, V&P.O. Gouchhi, Tehsil, Ballabgarh, Distt., Faridabad.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Davender Kumar S/o Sh. Lalu Ram Garg, R/o Gouchhi, Tehsil, Ballabgarh, Distt., Faridabad regarding non-taking of reading and billing on MMC basis.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply.

To day, the SDO has submitted the reply vide his memo No. 1679 dated 17.05.2010 through Nodal Officer, stating therein that due to non-submission of the documents for release of connection by the concerned JE and subsequently non-entry of the case, the billing to the consumer was raised on MMC basis from the date of connection to 1/2010. Now the documents from the concerned JE has been got collected and the bills raised on MMC basis has been adjusted. Rs. 14555/- has been debited to the account of the petitioner and the same shall be adjusted in the next billing months. The petitioner was also present and stated that he had been harassed by the staff including the SDO in connection of the bills and now as per the report, he is satisfied and requested for closer of the case.

It has been intimated that one Sh. Kuldeep Singh, the then J.E. In-charge of the area is responsible for not submission of the papers with the CA timely and the concerned C.A. of this Sub-Division is also responsible for his supervisory lapses respectively. The SE/Op. Circle, DHBVN, Faridabad is requested to issue the charge sheet to the above delinquent officials, under intimation to this Forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 433/2010
Date of Institution:09.06.2010
Date of Decision :22.07.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Vikram Yadav H.No.81, Sector 10A, Gurgaon.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Vikram Yadav, H.No.81, Sector-10A, Gurgaon

stating therein that since the change of meter of DS connection i.e. during the month of April, 2007 till to-date, his bills had not been given correctly, and he is visiting the Nigam's office for correction of his bills and in this process, lot of time is being wasted and huge expenditure is getting incurred. He further stated that some times office charged the amount and some other time refunded the amount. He had visited many times in the office of the SDO to enquire into the billing problem but no proper response had been given to him. Whenever, Sub-division issued the bill, he had been making the payment of the bills regularly after rectification of the same from Nigam.s office. Now, the Nigam has issued a bill of Rs.42826/- and he had approached the SDO office to supply him the details of above said bill. But no response/details is being given to him. The petitioner alleged that the staff of the Sub-Division had been harassing him from time to time, while correcting the bill from 04/2007 to till date.

The petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. The SDO submitted the reply vide his memo No. 454 dated 22.06.2010, stating therein that a sum of Rs.21448/- was charged by this office on account of short assessment from 07/2007 to 05/2008 vide SCA&R No. 8/2R, the old meter replaced by the Nigam and the same was not fed in the consumer account and new meter unit consumed 8636 units, the same was not billed against the consumer account and the bill was raised @ 600 units by monthly, the average units/amount adjusted and new meter reading consumption comes out to 8636 units and the amount charged accordingly.

-: 2 :-

After hearing both the parties on 24.6.2010, it was concluded that the honest and sincere consumer had been harassed by the staff of the sub division from time to time and this type of consumer should be honored rather than being harassed, who are making the payment well in time. On that day, It was ordered that the correct bill to the petitioner be raised by the SDO on the basis of actual reading of old meter as well as of new meter without imposing any surcharge upon the consumer and a copy of correct bill will be furnished by the SDO before the Forum on or before the next date of hearing. The surcharge, if any, comes-out due to negligence on the part of Nigam's officer/officials, be recovered from them proportionately. The SE/OP. Circle, DHBVN, Faridabad was also requested to issue a letter of warning to the SDO as well as to the CA of the sub division for harassing the honest and sincere consumer for his no fault and report compliance on the next date of hearing, which was fixed as 22.7.2010.

Today, the petitioner has reported that inspite of the directions from the Forum, the bill has not been corrected. The CA of the sub division was present and stated that the bill of the petitioner could not be issued correctly due to sundry item could not be posted in the system and the hand made bill is being given to the consumer to the satisfaction of the petitioner and accordingly, the hand made bill was given to the petitioner and the petitioner was satisfied and has given an undertaken that now he has no further grievance towards bill.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The SE/OP .Circle, DHBVN, Gurgaon is requested to confirm the Forum regarding the letters of warning, which was required to be issued to the concerned CA and SDO of the sub division, as per the proceedings held on 24.6.2010 for their negligence and harassment made to the sincere consumer.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 434/2010

Date of Institution: 29.06.2010

Date of Decision : 18.08.2010

In the matter of

**Smt. Gurupyari Devi, H.No. 658/B-2, Panchawala, Qutubpur, Distt.,
Rewari**

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Smt. Gurupyari Devi, H.No.658/B-2, Panchawala, Qutubpur, Distt., Rewari, stating therein that the Nigam had erected a pole in the vicinity of the petitioner long time back and now the same is in tilted condition and at any movement, this pole can be broken which will cause danger to the lives of the residents. The petitioner had further stated that he had already visited the office of the SDO many times for shifting of the pole which was erected in the vicinity of the petitioner but the SDO had insisted to get the amount deposited for shifting/removal of pole from the vicinity.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During proceedings held on 22.07.2010, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition vide his memo No. 114 dated 21.07.2010. After hearing the SDO and as well as the petitioner, the SDO was directed to remove/shift the pole at a safer place to avoid any accident at a later stage at the cost of the Nigam, as the pole erected after the construction of the petitioner's house.

To-day, a representative of the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No. 220 dated 17.8.2010 stated therein that the compliance of the order of the Forum has been complied with and the necessary shifting of wire as well as pole has been done and the consumer is satisfied. The consumer has also confirmed on telephone that her grievances has been redressed and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned the record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 435/2010
Date of Institution:07.07.2010
Date of Decision :03.08.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Parhlad Singh S/o Sh. Dhanna Ram, Manager, PNB, Mandi Adampur,
Distt., Hisar.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition has been received from Sh. Parhlad Singh S/o Sh. Dhanna Ram, Manager, PNB, Mandi Adampur stating therein that though he is making payment of the energy bills regularly but the Nigam had imposed an average amount of Rs.62832/- for the period, the meter remained defective which is very much high. He further stated that most of the times, their bank is being run through generator. He further stated that after replacement of the defective meter, the reading of the meter is less than the amount charged by the Audit, which may kindly be got rectified.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. During the proceedings held on 20.07.2010, the SDO was directed to supply the consumption data of the petitioner for one year from the date of defective meter and the data of to-day after replacement of the defective meter on the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 03.08.2010.

To-day, the SDO Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Adampur and the petitioner were present. The SDO submitted the reply of the petition along with consumption data for the period the meter remained defective and the data for the period, the meter is working O.K., through Nodal Officer vide his memo No. 2434 dated 02.08.2010. The consumption of working period for 48 days of new meter is comes out 1701.08 units. After considering the data as put up by the SDO before the Forum, the SDO was directed to charge the petitioner 1100 Units per month (for the load found at site is 6.440 kw) for the defective period instead of 1600 units charged (for the load of 15.500 kw)earlier to the petitioner.

The petitioner was present and he was given the copy of consumption data and he was fully satisfied with the decision of the Forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 436/2010
Date of institution : 8.7.2010
Date of Decision: 22.7.2010

In the matter of

Smt.Phoolwanti w/o Sh.Sudama Singh,House No.10,Gali No.1,Ravi Colony,Sehatpur,Faridabad.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Smt. Phool Wanti w/o Sh.Sudama Singh, resident of House No.10,Gali No.1,Ravi Colony, Sehatpur ,Faridabad against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply.

To day, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition through Nodal Officer vide his memo No.1685 dated 21.7.2010, stating therein that the account of the consumer has been overhauled and a sum of Rs 6451/- has been deducted through the sundry item No. SC&A No.122/R-49 and the final bill of Rs 9807/- rendered which has been deposited by the petitioner and the petitioner is fully satisfied. An undertaking in this regard has also been given by the petitioner that she is fully satisfied with the amount adjusted by the SDO and requested for closer of the case.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further ,hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 437/2010

Date of Institution: 08.07.2010

Date of Decision :03.08.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Anand S/o Sh. Ram Gopal, V&P.O. Sikanderpur, Distt., Bhiwani.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from the counsel of the petitioner Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate stating therein that his client namely Sh. Anand S/o Sh. Ram Gopal, r/o Sikanderpur, District Bhiwani had applied for electric connection for his unit under SP category vide application No. 20489. His client had deposited the necessary expenses for the above said connection vide receipt No. 138, 139 & 140 dated 18.8.2009 for Rs.10500/- as ACD, Rs.15000/- service connection charges & Rs.3980/- as cost of meter respectively. After deposited the above said amounts and completion of other formalities, his client became entitled to get the connection within 30 days from the date of deposit as per rules & instructions under electricity Act, 2003. That the official of the respondent SDO release the electricity connection on 8.03.2010, thereafter on the next date, his client visited the office of Nigam and the official of the Nigam asked the client to deposit Rs.46196/-. That the respondent Nigam had illegally got deposited the excess of Rs.15000/- on account of service connection charges and Rs.46196/- on account of service line charges. The aforesaid amounts are not chargeable from his client as per instructions of the Nigam. The service line was already existing in front of the premises of his client for the connection of other consumer namely R.C.Paper Industry & no extra material was used for providing the line to his client except T/F. Hence the client is entitled to get the refund of aforesaid amounts along with interest @ 24% per annum from the date of deposit till the actual payment. That the Nigam is not issuing the electricity bill till to-day inspite of repeated demands and requests. Therefore, his client is not liable to pay the surcharge on the bill in question which is issued by the Nigam. The action of the Nigam for non-issuance of bill and charging the excess amount is against the instructions of the Nigam and malafide.

Accordigly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 20.07.2010, the SDO was present and had submitted the reply of the petition stating therein that the above said complainant Sh. Anand, is not a consumer of the Nigam. This connection is obtained illegally without completing any formalities with the connivance of the Nigam staff with malafide intention. Moreover, the petitioner had already filed a civil suit in the civil court through his counsel at Hansi. After hearing the SDO, the SDO was directed to submit the proof of filing the case by the petitioner through his counsel, in the civil court at Hansi on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 03.08.2010.

To-day the SDO was present and he has submitted the detailed reply/proof. In the reply, the SDO has stated that Sh. Anand S/o Sh. Ram Gopal, V&P.O. Sikenderpur, Distt., Bhiwani, bearing application No. AP-20489/SP has already filed a Civil Suit in the Hon'ble Court of Sh. Vivek Naseer, Civil Judge, Hansi, and obtained stay order against disconnection of power supply which was taken illegally by the petitioner and later on detected by Vigilance Wing. The case was fixed for arguments on dated 31.07.2010. The SDO has stated in his reply that he was present in the Civil Court, Hansi for arguments, but the counsel of the petitioner, Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate was not present, and the arguments could not be held on 31.7.2010. Moreover, the consumer has no right to file an another writ petition in the other Court/Forum as per law. But Mr P.S.Saini, advocate of the petitioner had also submitted a bogus affidavit before the Hon'ble Forum, stating therein that no such case of the petitioner is pending in any other court but the case is under trial in the civil court at Hansi for which the date was fixed for arguments but Mr P.S.Saini, counsel of the petitioner did not appear for arguments on that date i.e. 31.7.2010. Moreover, M/s Anand Concrete (Sh. Anand) is not Nigam's consumer. The connection was illegally released by the JE of the Sub-Division, namely Sh. Ranbir Singh, JE(F) with the connivance of the applicant without completing any required formalities as per Nigam's instructions. For which a charge sheet against the erring official had already been framed and submitted to the Administration for further action.

The SDO further stated in the reply that after the Vigilance Cell had raided the premises of the petitioner, the petitioner was found of stealing energy with a load of 24.515 and accordingly a theft case was prepared on 09.03.2010 by the Vigilance Wing., and penalty of theft was imposed upon the petitioner to the tune of Rs 765236/- which was not deposited by the petitioner till date. After detection of theft of energy case by Vigilance Wing, the petitioner got deposited the security amount of Rs 46196/- of the connection again cleverly with the connivance of Consumer Clerk on the next day of detection of theft case on 10.3.2010, without the knowledge & permission of the SDO and also without depositing the penalty amount with the Nigam for theft of energy, and obtained a stay order from the civil court against disconnection of power supply.

Keeping in view the reply, connected documents of the case and statements of the SDO, the case of the petitioner is hereby rejected as the case of the petitioner is already lying pending in the other court at Hansi and the case is being defended by the same counsel of the petitioner, Sh.P.S.Saini, advocate. Since the documents of the same are in the custody of the Forum, and the counsel of the petitioner had submitted the bogus/fake affidavit before this Forum, the matter is required to be referred to the Bar Counsel of Haryana against the errant Advocate for necessary action for submitting the bogus/fake affidavit before the Forum, as per law.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 438/2010

Date of Institution:14.07.2010

Date of Decision :20.07.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Satya Parkash Garg, Partner of M/s Bharat Metals, Delhi Road, Hisar.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Satya Parkash Garg, Partner of M/s Bharat Metals, Delhi Road, Hisar against reduction in contract demand from 300 KVA to 210KVA with no change connected load on 22.1.2010 and completed all the required formalities as per instructions of the Nigam and submitted the same with XEN/Op. Divn. No.2, DHBVN, Hisar to avoid excess MMC charges. The application was duly received and a receipt of having received the application from the petitioner was issued by the staff of the XEN on 22.01.2010.

The petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-438/HSR dated 20.07.2010, stating therein that the consumer had deposited Rs.5250/-on account of processing fees vide BA-16 No. 259/59950 dated 04.03.2010 against A&A No. 21869. The reduction of load has been sanctioned by the XEN office vide his memo No. 2454/SD-13 dated 11.03.2010 subject to the condition that a fresh MCG agreement be obtained from the consumer duly attested by the Notary. The SDO has written a letter to the consumer vide his memo No. 5513 dated 15.03.2010 to submit the above documents and consumer had submitted the documents on 18.03.2010. The SDO office issued SJO No. 3/511 dated 18.03.2010 and regularized his ROL on dated 19.03.2010. Keeping in view, it is therefore, prayed that the complaint of the complainant may please be disposed off without cost, as there is no deficiency in services on the part of the SDO.

:- 2 :-

After hearing both the parties, the reply of the SDO is not found in order and it is ordered that the petitioner be given the benefit of reduction of contract demand from 300KVA to 210KVA w.e.f. 05.03.2010 (reading date after one month from the date of application), as the petitioner had completed all the formalities and submitted the A&A Form with the XEN office on 22.01.2010 and as per instructions in the SMI No. 1.11(B)(2)(2). If any formalities was required to be completed by the petitioner should have been intimated to the petitioner while accepting his request for reduction of contract demand. "The reduction in contract demand (with or without reduction in contract load) shall come into force w.e.f. the reading date immediately after the expiry of one month period from the date of application or reading date following affecting the SJO/MCO which ever is earlier." In the instant case, this effective date becomes 05.03.2010 i.e. the date after one month from the date of application. But the SDO has violated the Nigam instructions and continuously issued the bills on the basis of contract demand of 300 KVA i.e. MMC of Rs.75000/- instead of 210KVA i.e. MMC of Rs.52500/-, resulting into the excess charges of Rs.19515/-, which is not chargeable. The difference of amount Rs.19515/- from the final date of notice/request be refunded to the petitioner w.e.f. 05.03.2010.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 440/2010
Date of Institution:05.08.2010
Date of Decision :18.08.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Manoj Kumar S/o Sh. Om Parkash, Narnaul Road, Nangal Chaudhary,
Distt., Mohindergarh.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Manoj Kumar S/o Sh. Om Parkash, Narnaul Road, Nangal Chaudhary, Distt., Mohindergarh, against wrong billing.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted his reply vide his memo NO. 500 dated 17.08.2010, stating therein that due to non-posting of correct account number in the ledger, the consumer amount could not be regularized as he stated that the consumer had himself deposited the amount by giving wrong account number to the Ledger Clerk. Now the bill of the petitioner has been rectified and the petitioner is satisfied and an acknowledgement in this regard has also been furnished by the petitioner.

The SDO was asked as to why the bill/account was not corrected inspite of repeated visits by the petitioner to your office for the last one year. This is clear cut violation of HERC regulation and the responsibility be fixed against the delinquent official. The SE/Op. Circle, DHBVN, Narnaul is requested to issue a letter of warning to the concerned SDO for his lapses, while redressal of the grievance of the petitioner.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned the record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 441/2010
Date of Institution: 09.08.2010
Date of Decision : 16.09.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Arun Gupta S/o Sh. Ram Kumar Gupta, A-115, Shushant Lok, Phase-I, Gurgaon.

	V/s	DHBVN
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present in person.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

ORDER

A petition has been received from Sh. Arun Gupta S/o Sh. Ram Kumar Gupta, A-115, Shushant Lok, Phase-I, Gurgaon against running of fast meter and the correction of bill.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the reply vide memo No. 852 dated 15.09.2010 stating therein that as per the directions made on 18.08.2010, the checking report of the meter has been got from M&P, Gurgaon. After going through the report, it has been established that the MDI of the meter was found abnormal by 165 KW against the sanctioned load 47 KW. On the basis of M&P report, the account of the consumer has been overhauled and a sum of Rs.2,83,086/- have been refunded vide SC&AR No. 440/21R dated 15.09.2010 and the effect of this amount will be reflected in the next billing months. The consumer has been directed to arrange his new LT/CT meter due to his existing meter defective for replacement by new meter.

The consumer was present and he was directed to supply LT/CT meter to the SDO for replacement of his defective meter at the earliest. The consumer was satisfied with the decision of the Forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

—

Case No. 442/2010

Date _____ **of** _____

Institution:13.08.2010

Date of Decision :09.09.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Mool Chand Saini S/o Sh. Deen Dayal, H.No.75/16, Mahabir Colony, Hisar.

V/s **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Mool Chand Saini, R/o Hisar regarding non-release of his connection since, 2005 and the refund of excess amount charged on account of change of category of connection from NDS to DS.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present and he has submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 09.09.2010 stating therein that the petitioner had applied for DS connection. At that time, the estimate for erection of pole has been framed and consumer had requested to deposit the same but the consumer had not deposited the said amount.

Now the pole has been erected and accordingly the file of the consumer has been accepted and Service Connection Order for the same has already been issued vide SCO No. 46758/10-11. Earlier the consumer had deposited Rs.740/- for the cost of meter but due to non-availability of meter in the Store, a notice has been sent to the petitioner to submit his own meter for his

connection. After receipt of the meter, the connection of the petitioner shall be released.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the SDO had harassed him for non-release of this connection and he has already deposited the meter with the Nigam as desired by the SDO. The SDO was directed to get the meter tested from the M&T Lab immediately and release the connection accordingly.

-: 2 :-

As far as, his other grievance regarding refund of the already amount charged by the Nigam is concerned on account of change of category of connection, the petitioner has not intimated the Account Number vide which the amount was charged. Due to non-availability of account number his office is unable to take action regarding refund of the amount. The petitioner was present and he was directed to supply the photo copy of the bill of NDS connection to the SDO, so that action could be taken by the SDO accordingly, as per instructions of the Nigam and report compliance.

Since, the cause of action is over there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 443/2010

Date of Institution: 13.08.2010

Date of Decision : 27.08.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Lilu Ram S/o Sh. Partap Singh, V&P.O. Mayyar, Distt., Hisar.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Lilu Ram S/o Sh. Partap Singh, V&PO. Mayyar, Distt., Hisar regarding non-replacement of his defective meter and billing on an average basis since, 2005.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the reply vide his memo No. 3444 dated 26.08.2010 stating therein that the consumer had deposited a sum of Rs.650/- on account of meter cost vide BA-16 No. 182/38-12 dated 11.08.2005. Due to non-availability of meter in the store and the papers pertaining to replacement of meter, the meter could not be replaced. Now the meter has been arranged for the replacement of defective meter and the meter shall be replaced to-day and the bill of the petitioner shall be overhauled on the basis of reading of two billing cycle.

The petitioner was also present and he was also satisfied with the statement of the SDO. The SDO was directed to-do the needful done as per his statement given above. In the meantime, the current payment be accepted till the overhauling of the account of the petitioner.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. 444/2010

Date of Institution: 13.08.2010

Date of Decision : 27.08.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Balbir Singh, Gas Agency Road, Hansi, Distt.,
Hisar.

V/s **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was filed by Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Balbir Singh, R/o Hansi, Distt., Hisar regarding excess charging of amount.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the reply stating therein that the consumer had taken NDS connection with sanctioned load of 0.640KW, during the year March, 2001, bearing A/C No. A2-21/6696. Later on, the computer had raised the load of NDS connection from 0.640KW to 2.00KW during the same year. After that, during 8/2007, again the computer had raised 1.00 KW extra loads of all the NDS consumers and the load was automatically from 2.00KW to 3.00KW. The consumer did not apply for extension of load at any stage. This load was increased by the computer for MMC purpose only. The statement of consumer that he had deposited the cost of extension of load in the Nigam office is false, as he had not deposited any cost with the Nigam nor he is having any receipt in token of proof of having deposited the cost with the Nigam.

The SDO has further stated before the Forum that during the month of Feb., 2010, the AGM/Enforcement, DHBVN, Hisar had raided his premises and the load was found at site 4.443KW and the penalty was imposed for unauthorized extension of load to the tune of Rs.12800/- vide SCAR No. 228/147, as per the details given below;

:- 2 :-

ACD for difference of load 4.443KW say 5KW(-) 0.640KW say 1KW.
This difference is 5-1= 4KW.

ACD	= 4KWx1000x2	= Rs. 8000-00
Penalty	= 4x100x12	= Rs.4800-00
Total:		= Rs.12800.00

Thereafter, the consumer had represented to his office against the load detected by the Vigilance. On request of the petitioner, Sh. Krishan Lal, JE was deputed to check the load at site and he found the load at site 2.205KW say 3KW. On submission of the report by the JE, his office refunded the extra amount of ACD for 2KW load amounting to Rs.4000/- vide SCAR No. 59/152. The penalty cannot be refunded as per Sales Circular No. 37/2007 and as per Sales Circular No.43/2007.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the load detected by the Vigilance is not true and the same had been got checked by the SDO from the JE concerned and the load was found 2.205KW and the penalty be imposed only for the load, as he has no work in his shop. Moreover the Nigam had increased the load at his own and without the consent of the petitioner, which is illegal and against the rule.

After hearing both the parties and keeping in view the contradictory report of Vigilance and the Nigam, this Forum has ordered the SDO to charge the ACD of 2KW and the penalty of single time, which is given as under:

ACD	=2KWx1000x1	= Rs.2000-00
Penalty	=2x100x12	= Rs.2400-00
Total		= Rs.4400-00

The bill of the petitioner be overhauled accordingly and the load of the consumer be regularized accordingly. The petitioner was present and he was satisfied with the above decision of the Forum. The SDO was directed to comply the order of the Forum and send the compliance report through the Nodal Officer.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(R.R.Goel)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman