

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. 445/2010

Date of Institution: 30.08.2010

Date of Decision : 06.10.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Mahabir Singh S/o Sh. Baru Ram, V&P.O. Narnaund, 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. Mahabir Singh S/o Sh. Baru Ram, V&PO. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar before this Forum regarding non-release of his tube well connection applied in the name of his father namely Sh. Baru Ram S/o Sh. Chiranjee of V.P.O. Narnaund inspite of deposited the desired amount on dated 11.03.2008.

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

During the hearing held on 09.09.2010, the SDO was present and he had submitted the reply, which is given as under:-

1. That it is correct that the above named consumer has deposited security for tubewell connection as Rs.22550/- vide BA-16 No. 366/4779, 367/4779, 368/4779 dated 11.03.2008 & Rs.7000/- vide BA-16 No.36546 dated 02.02.09.
2. That the demand notice was issued to above consumer for T/W connection vide memo No. 4016 dated 04.02.2009.
3. That the SCO was issued by the then SDO (Op) S/Divn., Narnaund vide SCO No. 94/180 dated 14.11.09 and the same was handed over to area concerned JE.
4. That the above connection was released by area concerned JE on 08.01.2010 through turnkey basis.
5. That after passing some times from release of connection, coils of consumer's T/F were stolen by any miscreant but no complaint was made to SDO (OP) S/Divn., Narnaund by the said consumer.
6. That after receiving a complaint of consumer through higher authority of Nigam pertaining to theft of T/F, the SHO Police Station, Narnaund was requested vide SDO (OP) S/Divn., Narnaund office memo No. 2501 dated 08.07.2010 to register an FIR.
7. That this office has also requested to SHO Police Station, Narnaund vide this office memo No. Spl-1 dated 15.07.10 to lodge an FIR against the miscreants but no heed has been taken by SHO Narnaund as yet.
8. That the allegations leveled by above consumer in this application that T/W connection was not released so far are totally wrong and baseless as he himself admitted in his complaint which was addressed to higher authorities of Nigam that his T/F has been stolen which clearly means that T/F has been installed through turnkey basis and the said connection has been released on 08.01.2010.
9. That the SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Narnaund has again requested verbally and written vide his office memo No. dated 06.09.10 to SHO Police Station, Narnaund to lodge an FIR against the miscreants but no action has been taken in this matter and in the absence of FIR of said T/F, the same can not be allocated by the competent authority as per instruction of Nigam.

After going through the reply, the SDO was asked as to why the T/F was not arranged for so many months for restoration of the supply of the petitioner tube well. The SDO stated that they have tried their level best to lodge the FIR but the FIR had not been lodged by the Police Authorities. Due to non-registration of FIR, the T/F could not be allocated from the Divisional Office, as per Nigam's instructions. After hearing the version of the SDO, the SDO was directed that in this episode, the petitioner has no fault and why he should suffer. The supply be restored immediately by arranging another T/F of the same capacity and report compliance. The SDO had requested that he is ready to restore the supply at the tube well but he may be given minimum 10 days time for arranging the T/F for restoration of power supply at the tube well of the petitioner. His request was granted and he was given 10 days time for restoration of the supply i.e. latest by 19.9.2010. The Nodal Officer was present and he was instructed to comply the order of the Forum within time schedule allowed to the SDO for restoration of supply, and thereafter the compliance be reported on or before the next date of hearing which is fixed for 6.10.2010.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO has submitted before the Forum that the new T/F has been arranged and installed at the site of the tube well of the petitioner and meter has also been installed. The SDO further stated that the petitioner has not acknowledged the replacement of T/F and installation of meter so far, for the reason best known to him. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he stated that he has not constructed the Kotha for installation of motor and other equipments required for the power supply at the tube well. Moreover, when the supply had not been utilized by him, why the Nigam is charging MMC and MMC may kindly be waived off for the earlier period i.e. from 08.01.2010 to 18.9.2010, as during this period, the stolen T/F was not replaced. He further requested that he may kindly be given 10 days time to construct the Kotha etc. and installation of motor.

After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was directed that the consumer/petitioner be allowed 10 days time to construct and install the motor at his tube well and the supply be restored thereafter. As far as the request of the petitioner regarding waiving off MMC charged by the Nigam for the period 08.01.2010 to 18.09.2010, the request of the petitioner is found to be genuine as the petitioner had not utilized the power supply during the period whether T/F was stolen and replaced and the same is not chargeable from the petitioner, subject to the condition that the petitioner should construct and install the motor at his tube well within the stipulated period of 10 days. The consumer was satisfied with the decision of the Forum and assured the Forum that he will fulfill his promise as given by him before 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. 446/2010

Date of institution : 16.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter

Maj. V.K.Choudhary S/o Sh. Virender Kumar, B-9, Jadunath Enclave, Army Welfare Housing Orgn. Complex, Sector-29, Distt. Faridabad.

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 was received from Sh. V.K.Choudhary, R/o B-9, Jadunath Enclave, Army Welfare Housing Orgn. Complex, Sector-29, Faridabad, regarding running of meter without load and replacement thereof.

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

On the date of hearing which was fixed on 20.10.2010, the representative of the SDO was present and he has submitted the reply, stated therein that the petitioner was asked to supply his own meter but the petitioner insisted for the departmental meter. After convincing the petitioner, the petitioner ready to deposit the cost of the meter.

The SDO was directed that when the petitioner had deposited the cost of the meter, then the meter be arranged at his level and replace the defective meter before the next date of hearing. In the meantime, not to disconnect the connection of the petitioner. After installation of new meter, the billing be charged on the basis of consumption recorded by new meter of two billing cycles

Today, the representative of the SDO was present and submitted a memo of SDO, stated therein that the meter of the petitioner has been replaced vide MCO No.33/66 effected on 26.10.2010 . Further, it is submitted that the consumer was billed on an average basis for the period 1/10 to 5/10 and 7/10, as the meter was defective. However, as per order of the Forum, the a/c for the above mentioned periods has been overhauled on the basis of the reading on the same month for the previous year. The adjustment has been posted vide SC&AR No.126/R131 and the adjustment will be reflected in the coming bi-monthly bill. More, the petitioner has also acknowledged the statement made by the SDO on telephone that his grievances have been redressed and the case may kindly be closed.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO and the statement made by the petitioner on telephone, 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. 447/2010

Date of institution :16.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Smt. Geeta Mohan W/o Sh. Lalit Mohan, H.No.1009, Sector-22/B, Gurgaon.

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Smt. Geeta Mohan, R/o H.No.1009, Sector-22/B, Gurgaon regarding wrong billing on an average basis and correction thereof.

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

During the hearing held on 20.10.2010, the SDO was present and submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide memo No. Ch-4/Forum-447/GGN dated 14.10.2010, stated therein that the petitioner was billed on average basis from 15.9.2007 to 6.02.2009 being D-Code as per consumption data attached. He further stated that the meter of the consumer was replaced on 27.02.2009 vide MCO No. 7805/08/09 dated 27.11.2008. After replacement of meter, the consumer was billed from 26.3.2009 to 8.07.2009 on an average basis being N-Code. Simultaneously, the consumer was billed from 8.07.2009 to 25.06.2010 as per consumption recorded in the new meter, which is correct. The meter of the consumer again replaced on 14.07.2010 vide MCO No. 56418/10/11 dated 07.10.2010. The SDO has further intimated that the petitioner has paid Rs.26198/- on 23.07.2010, the consumer was rendered the energy bill for the month of 08/2010 for Rs.90422/- including the previous balance of Rs.73642/-. The account of the consumer will be overhauled on the basis of the consumption recorded during six months by the new meter, which was replaced on 14.07.2010.

After hearing the reply, the SDO was directed that the account of the consumer be overhauled on the basis of the consumption of previous year of the same preceding months of the year. In the meantime, not to disconnect the connection of the petitioner till the overhauling of the account of the petitioner. Only the current payment be accepted.

Today, the SDO as well as the petitioner were present. The petitioner submitted another representation, stated therein that as per the verbal/written communication, the

picture is not clear to me. The reply sent by the AGM is not clear to me and he should be given clear cut order to rectify my bill according to the consumption in the meter. She has further requested that she being a working women , can not attend /visit the office of SDO frequently for rectification of her bill and her bill be got overhauled by taking the base of two billing cycle instead of three billing cycle.

Keeping in view the circumstances explained by the petitioner, the SDO was directed to over haul the bill/account of the petitioner by taking the base of consumption of two billing cycle instead of three billing cycle and in the mean time due to accumulation of defaulting amount ,not to disconnect the premises/connection of the petitioner till overhaul and finalization of the bill . The petitioner was satisfied with the decision of the Forum. The SDO was further directed to comply the order of the Forum through the Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar.

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. 448/2010
Date of Institution:21.09.2010
Date of Decision : 06.10.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Rattan Singh S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Ward No.4, V&PO. Narnaund, 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. Rattan Singh S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Ward No.4, V&PO. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar regarding removal of meter without any notice and without any reason and the amount is being charged after removal of meter.

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

During the hearing, the SDO submitted the reply vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 06.10.2010 stating therein that the connection to the petitioner was given at his original place of residence at Khanda Road, Main Bazar, Narnaund vide A&A No. 43773 dated 23.08.2006. Thereafter, the consumer at his own will and without the information of the Nigam, got shifted his meter with the connivance of the Nigam staff at his new site in Ward No.4, V&PO. Narnaund. After receiving the information, the said meter was removed. The petitioner who was present and asked him as to why the meter was shifted from one site to another site without permission and intimation to the Nigam? The petitioner stated that due to damage of original house during raining season, the house was constructed at another site and the meter was so installed at the original site, was supplied by him and the property was belonging to him so he got shifted the meter at new site. But inspite of the stay order, the meter has been removed. On the other hand, the SDO was present and stated that where the petitioner had shifted the meter is a disputed land and the stay only against removal of construction had been granted by the court as per the documents supplied by the petitioner. But in this case, no stay order of removal of meter has been given.

The petitioner has requested that till the finalization/vacation of stay, the meter may kindly be got re-installed so that he may take the power supply. After hearing, the version of the petitioner, his request was not found to be genuine as the petitioner had violated

the Nigam's instructions and shifted the meter from one site to another site, which is illegal. The Forum has directed the SDO/Nodal Officer that if the petitioner wants to take/reinstall his electric meter which was supplied by the petitioner and thereafter removed by the SDO, then he may approach the Civil Court for this purpose. The SDO was directed if the petitioner produce any documents in regard to release of connection, then the action be taken promptly and according to the Nigam instructions. The petitioner 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. 449/2010

Date of institution case 22.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Col. S.S.Malik(Retd.) S/o Sh. Umrao Singh, Wellington Estate, DLF City, Gurgaon.A/c No.BS-65.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition has been received from Col. S.S. Malik (Retd.) R/o Wellington Estate, DLF City, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.4222686/-

.Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

Today, the petitioner was present and stated that their Society had taken the bulk supply(DS) connection with a sanctioned load of 1000 KW during 2005. DHBVN had raised demand for Rs 4222686/- on the basis of survey carried out by the Nigam on 14.6.2010. The Nigam had charged the difference between BS Non Domestic and BS domestic w.e.f. 8th Jan.2008. Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in Commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 4222686/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above.

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment ,lifts and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006..

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner, so 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 is 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. 450/2010

Date of institution : 22.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Rajiv Jaggi S/o Late Sh. Shree Ram Jaggi, Belevedere Tower, DLF Phase-II, Gurgaon.A/c No.BS-35.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Rajiv Jaggi R/o Belevedere Tower, DLF Phase-II, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.2951624/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply Para wise, on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2011.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 2951624/- vide memo No.1243 dated 24.6.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently ,it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in Commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Greivances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 2951624/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment ,lifts and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 451/2010

Date of institution :22.9.2010

In the matter of

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

Sh. Dipankar Chakrabarty S/o Sh. S.C. Chakrabarty, Trinity Tower, DLF City, Phase-III, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-96

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh.,Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Dipankar Chakrabarty, R/o Trinity Tower, DLF City, Phase-III, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.2239622/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 2239622/- vide memo No.1235 dated 24.6.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in Commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 2239622/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 452/2010

Date of institution;22.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Kuldeep Bhatia S/o Sh. Shiv Dayal Bhatia, Bevedere Partk, DLF City, Phase-V, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-63

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Kuldeep Bhatia, R/o Bevedere Park, DLF City, Phase-V, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.3280503/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and the he was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 3280503/- vide memo No.1699 dated 4.8.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Greivances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply , all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 3280503/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 453/2010

Date of institution : 22.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. R.C.Tiwari S/o Sh. J.D.Tiwari, H.No.704, Royal Palm Apt. GH-6, Sector-56, Gurgaon. A/c No./BS-64

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh.Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. R.C.Tiwari, R/o H.No.704, Royal Palm Apt. GH-6, Sector-56, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.5425141/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Office/Xen.concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and the SDO was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 5425141/- vide memo No.1697 dated 4.8.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Greivances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 5425141/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner, so 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. 454/2010

Date of institution :22.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. V.K.Gupta S/o Late Sh. O.P.Gupta, C4C-101, Carlton Estate-IV, DLF City, Phase-V, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-69

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. V.K.Gupta, R/o C4C-101, Carlton Estate-IV, DLF City, Phase-V, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.6797830/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10., 2010 was not in order and the Xen. was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 6797830/- vide memo No.1695 dated 4.8.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

That the sprit of the HERC order dated 13.6.20120 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 1KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply , all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 6797830/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 455/2010

Date of institution : 22.9.2011

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Sonik Porwal S/o Late Sh. P.C.Porwal, 02C063, Oakwood Estate, Akashneem Marg, DLF Phase-II, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-18

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. Sonik Porwal, R/o 02C063, Oakwood Estate, Akashneem Marg, DLF, Phase-II, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.4251705/-.

. Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 4251705/- vide memo No.1855 dated 11.8.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008. Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Greivances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 4251705/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

That the sprit of the HERC order dated 13.6.20120 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 1KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply , all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 456/2010

Date of institution : 24.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. J.C.Malhotra S/o Late Sh.Panna Lal Malhotra, Apartment No.1611B, Beverly Park-II, DLF City Phase-II, MG Road, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-12

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition was received from Sh. J.C.Malhotra, R/o Apartment No.1611B, Beverly Park-II, DLF City, Phase-II, MG Road, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.2643530/-.

. Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen. on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 2643530/- vide memo No.1698 dated 4.8.2010 based on a survey carried out on 14.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008 @ Rs 4.09 paisa instead of 3.50 per unit as our common area connected load of 290 KW against total sanctioned load of 2216KW was within the permissible limit of 15% as required under Sales Circular No.62/2006. Therefore, on the other hand while the Nigam verified common area connected load to be 15% of total sanctioned load on 4.7.2008. On the other hand Xen .KCG Divison retroactive to 1.7.2008 has now levied bulk on domestic supply of Rs 4.09 per unit. The action is totally illogical and contradicts the earlier authorization of charging bulk supply domestic tariff of Rs 3.50 per unit by Xen. Their Association had also filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Greivances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee. In the light of above, it is prayed that the demand of the

Nigam be set aside, the condition of 15% of common area connected load be removed as long as it is being used for residential purposes and treat all the loads of lifts, fire fighting and water supply equipments etc. domestic load and not a part of non domestic load of common area. Domestic bulk supply rate of Rs 3.50 per unit to the societies may be restored with retrospective effect and the Nigam may be directed to withdraw the demand raised by them including the arrears.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 1KV and distribution of electricity upto the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply , all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 2643530/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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. 457/2010

Date of institution : 27.9.2010

Date of decision : 25.11.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Vinay Jha S/o Late Yogendra Narain Jha, LCG405B, The Laburnum, Sushant Lok, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-8

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Aneesh Kumar, Nodal Officer

ORDER

A petition has been received from Sh. Vinay Jha, R/o LCG405B, The Laburnum, Sushant Lok, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection amounting to Rs.8410710/-.

. Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. The reply submitted by the Nodal Officer/Xen concerned on 20.10.2010, was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply Para wise on the next date of hearing i.e. on 25.11.2010.

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 8410710/- vide memo No.1246 dated 4.8.2010 & 1510 dated 19.7.2010, based on a survey carried out on 11.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from 8.1.2008.... Their Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory), transmission & distribution losses, spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of

DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the DLF sub division, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 8410710/- was charged w.e.f. 8.1.2008 i.e. from the date of checking. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above .

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner , so 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 is 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. 458/2010

Date of Institution: 11.10.2010

Date of Decision : 14.02.2011

In the matter of

Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gharshi Ram, Near Maharishi Vidya Mandir, Rajgarh Road, Gangwa, 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. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Garshi Ram, R/o Hisar against the load reduction of his connection by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh, R/o V&PO. Gangwa, Distt., Hisar by submitting fake documents, bearing A/C No. GG11/0949 from 3 KW to 1KW vide application No.16843/DS dated 04.05.2007.

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

During the hearing, the SDO has stated that the matter has been got checked up and it has been found that Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Garshi Ram had applied for electricity connection at his land during the year 2000 vide application No.5038/DS dated 21.8.2000 and the connection was released on 12.10.2000. During the year, the same land was sold by his wife Smt. Darshna Devi W/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gharshi Ram to Sh. Bharat Singh S/o Sh. Amar Singh Mutbana, R/o Mohabatpur, Tehsil, Adampur, Distt., Hisar on dated 04.05.2004. Thereafter, the same land was handed over by Sh. Bharat Singh S/o Sh. Amar Singh to Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh, R/o V&PO> Gangwa, Distt., Hisar for his use through Girdawari and the payments of electricity bills were made regularly by Sh Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh since the date of occupation of land.

On 04.05.2007, Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh had applied for change of name and reduction of load from 3KW to 1KW vide A&A No.16843/DS and got the reduction of load from 3KW to 1 KW with the connivance of Nigam's official without completion of legal formalities and is making the payments of electricity bills since the changed of name of connection in his name to till date. During gap of about 7 years, Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Gharshi Ram did not turn up in the office to enquire into his electricity connection and making payments of the electricity consumption bills which was

taken by him during 2000 nor had he made any payment of electricity bills. All the payments had been made by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh, the user of land.

The SDO has further stated that when the same land had been sold by his wife to Sh. Bharat Singh S/o Sh. Amar Singh, R/o Mohabatpur, thereafter he has no right to interfere on the issue of electricity connection or otherwise on the same land but the connection changed in his name by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh with the connivance of the then Consumer Clerk without completing legal formalities was wrong. The connection should have been got changed by the actual owner of the land and not by the Sh.Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh.Chattar Singh,as alleged by the petitioner Sh.Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh.Gharsi Ram, in his petition.

Sh. Vinod Gupta, Advocate was present on behalf of Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh. The counsel of the defendant Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh was also present and has stated that when the land sold by the petitioner's wife to Sh. Bharat Singh S/o Sh. Amar Singh, then he has no right to claim any thing on the issue of land and the electricity connection. If the claim of the petitioner is genuine,then he should have come forward to make the payment of the energy bills or enquire into the activities being committed on the land. But he has no option but to adopting the black mailing tactics on one pretext or the other . A Civil suit of the same land is also pending in the civil court.

After hearing both the parties, it is ordered that the application for change of connection and reduction of load as submitted and got executed by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh, R/o V&PO. Gangwa from the name of Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Gharshi Ram to his name without submitting proper/legal documents, while change of name the connection and reduction of load from 3KW to 1KW, be got cancelled immediately till the legal formalities are completed by Sh. Ramesh Kumar S/o Sh. Chattar Singh. The action against the delinquent the then Consumer Clerk of the Sub-Division who had dealt the case file without verification of the facts & failed to perform his official duties while dealing with the case file of ' change of name and reduction of load' be initiated and report compliance through the Nodal Officer.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File be consigned to record.

(V.P.Gupta)
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. 459/2010
Date of Institution: 26.10.2010
Date of Decision :24.03.2011

In the matter of
Sh. Deepak Chopra, House No.592,Sector-21A, 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. Deepak Chopra, H.No.592, Sector-21A, Faridabad against running of fast meter and billing thereof.

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

During the proceedings held on 25.11.2010, the petitioner stated that he is residing in H.No.592, Sector-21A, Faridabad and he is receiving the energy bills more than the consumptions of his electricity since, October, 2009. He made several representations to the various authorities to check up the matter but all in vein. He also supplied a new meter to replace the defective meter but the bill is not coming as per his load consumption. On the other hand, the SDO was present and stated that the matter has been checked up and the meter is found in order.

After hearing the SDO, the SDO was directed to again visit the premises personally and check the meter accuracy as per the load a report in this regard be furnished to the Forum on the next date of hearing.

During the hearing held on 24.12.2010, the SDO submitted his report stated therein that DHBVN Line Staff Team visited the site on 4.12.2010 and found that the electric cable of other neighbourer consumer i.e. Sh. R.Raman, R/o H.No.547, Sector-21A, Faridabad was inter-changed with his meter. He further stated that this mistake was done by the Line Staff while shifting of meter from in-side the premises to out-side the pole in advertently, resulting into the change of electricity consumption with each other. After hearing the SDO, the SDO was directed to change the supply from the original cable to the meter and the calculations of units be made of both the consumers and action be taken accordingly for recovery of excess units charged to the petitioner from the nearby consumer whose consumption was much more than the consumption of the petitioner and report compliance on the next date of hearing, which was fixed for 20.01.2011.

During the proceedings held on 20.01.2011, the SDO had submitted his report stated therein that the reading record of both the consumers, the account of Sh. Deepak Chopra, bearing A/C No. BB-12-1047 has been calculated and an amount of Rs.208333/- will be credited in the account of the petitioner in the next billing and the same amount will be debited to the other consumer i.e. Sh. R.Raman, bearing A/C No. BB12-1839. A notice had been served upon to Sh. R.Raman for depositing the difference of units consumed by him amounting to Rs.208333/- vide his memo No. 7994 dated 19.01.2011.

On the other hand, the petitioner prayed that he may kindly be got refunded the amount of excess payment made by him due to negligency of Nigam's staff in cash and not the amount be adjusted in his future bills consumption, at the earliest as he had suffered a lot during these periods. After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was directed to held up Rs.30000/- out of the total amount charged in excess and arrange a cheque of balance amount which was to be paid to the petitioner for the excess amount made by him due to negligency of Nigam's staff by the next date of hearing.

During the next date of hearing i.e. on 24.02.2011, SDO had stated that due to some technical reasons, the Drawing Limit of the amount to be refunded to the petitioner could not be arranged and they may kindly be given next date to arrange the same.

To-day, the SDO was present and stated a memo vide No. 8459 dated 21.03.2011 stated therein that the as per the order of the Hon'ble Forum, a cheque No. 298987 dated 01.03.2011, amounting to Rs.1,78,333/- in favour of Sh. Deepak Chopra had been issued to the petitioner and held up Rs.30000/- and the same had been credited in the account of the petitioner against the billing of his future bills vide SC&AR No.634/R-153.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, as the petitioner was satisfied with the decision of the Forum. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(V.P.Gupta)
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. 460/2010
Date of Institution: 27.10.2010
Date of Decision : 24.12.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Mool Chand Saini, Nalapur, Narnaul A/c No. SSID185.

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. Mool Chand Saini, resident of Nalapur, Narnaul, presently residing in Mahavir colony, Hisar against re-connection of his connection which was disconnected on defaulting amount, bearing a/c No. SSID185.

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

During the hearing in 25.11.2010, the SDO submitted his reply was not in order. SDO was directed to submit the reply of the petition para-wise so that further action could be taken accordingly.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer, submitted therein that a settlement has been arrived upon in between the complainant and the Nigam. After correction of the outstanding amount of the bill of the petitioner, an amount of Rs.2000/- has been deposited by the petitioner vide RO4 No. 14/27581 dated 13.12.2010. The petitioner has also applied for a new connection by depositing Rs.560/- vide BA16 No. 64/29709 dated 14.12.2010 and the connection of the petitioner has been released on the same day. The consent of the petitioner has also been supplied by the SDO stating therein that his grievances has been redressed, now he has no complaint 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. 461/2010
Date of Institution: 29.10.2010
Date of Decision :15.12.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Jai Parkash S/o Sh. Mool Chand, V&PO. Chamarkhera, Tehsil, Uklana, 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 received from Sh. Jai Parkash, R/o Chamarkhera, Tehsil, Uklana, Distt. Hisar against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. On the date of hearing i.e. on 11.11.2010, the SDO could not submit the reply of the petition due to non-receipt of petition in time. He was directed to submit the reply on the next date of hearing.

To-day the SDO concerned was present and submitted the reply stated therein that the grievances of the petitioner has been redressed and has requested for closer of the case. In-support of his claim, he has also submitted an acknowledgement which was taken by him after Redressal of the grievances, from 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.

(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. 462/2010
Date of Institution:03.11.2010
Date of Decision :15.12.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Attar Singh S/o Sh. Bhagtawar Singh, R/o 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 received from Sh. Attar Singh, R/o Hansi against the removal of meter due to non-deposited the wrong amount of the bill by the Nigam.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply. On the last date of hearing i.e. on 11.11.2010, the SDO was directed to set-right the bill of the petitioner and report compliance on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 15.12.2010. Also the petitioner was directed to visit the office of the SDO for getting the formality completed for the reconnection of his connection.

To-day the SDO was present and submitted the documents stated therein that the bill of the petitioner has been overhauled. The SDO has further stated that the petitioner has not come forward for completion of his paper formalities for restoring the supply till to-day and due to non-completion of formalities, the supply cannot be restored.

The SDO was directed to get in touch with the petitioner for getting the needful done at his level and restore the supply thereafter.

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. 463/2010
Date of Institution: 15.11.2010
Date of Decision : 15.12.2010

In the matter of
**Smt Anita Rani W/o Sh.Surinder Kumar C/o Sh. Harish Chhabra, Advcate, V&P.O.
Rania, Distt.Sirsa.**

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. Anita Rani W/o Sh. Surender Kumar, R/o Rania against the billing problem.

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 of the petition, vide Nodal Officer , DHBVN, Hisar memo No.Ch.4/Forum-463/SRS dated 14.12.2010, stated therein that the complainant is not a consumer of the respondents and the connection is in the name of Sh.Ram Kishan S/o Sh.Daulat Ram, bearing a/c No.TR-50/205/DS. The connection of the consumer was checked by Sh.Laxmi Chand,JE with other staff of the Nigam on 21.1.2009 in the presence of Sh.Surinder Kumar, who refused to sign on the checking report intentionally. Both the M&T seals were found tempered and the theft of energy case was made against the consumer under section 135 and the amount was charged on the basis of load found at site, as per instructions of the Nigam.

Keeping in view the report of the SDO, this is a case of theft of energy and this forum cannot adjudicate the cases of theft of energy as per HERC Regulation, hence the case is hereby rejected.

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. 464/2010

Date of institution : 22.9.2010

Date of decision : 24.12.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Anil Kumar Choudhary, Flat No.306, The Surya Co-op.Group Housing Society, Plot No.GH-71, Sector 55, Gurgaon-A/c No.BS-28.

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 was received from Sh. Anil Kumar Choudhary, Flat No.306, The Surya Co-op.Group Society, Plot No.GH-71, Sector 55, Gurgaon, a/c No.BS-28 regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection (from DS bulk supply to NDS bulk supply) w.e.f. Jan.2007, amounting to Rs.437194/-.

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

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 437194/- vide memo No.1858 dated 11.8.2010 based on a survey carried out in June-2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with effect from Jan.2007. Some other similarly affected Condominium Associations filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010, held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission's order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, set up by the Licensee. That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.10.2006, was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power(mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen .of the area has submitted his reply ,stating therein that during the special checking conducted by the team of the Nigam & on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as per Nigam instructions as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load, and as per the Audit half margin, Rs 437194/- was charged w.e.f. Jan.2007. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above.

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment, Lifts and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the latest Commission's order .

After hearing both the parties, & also going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner, so 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 is 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. 465/2010
Date of institution :29.11.2010
Date of decision : 24.2.2011

In the matter of

Sh.Arvind Sahni S/o Sh.B.K.Sahni,H.No.366, Palam Vihar,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 received from Sh.Arvind Sahni, resident of H.No.366, Palam Vihar,Gurgaon, stated therein , that the property of House No.366, Palam Vihar ,Gurgaon was purchased and possession taken by him from the earlier owner Mr Madan Mohan in August-1998. Since the time from taking possession, only one electric meter was installed in the premises and he is making the payment of the bills which were received by him under a/c No.PV01/2001-W. Thereafter, he had received another bill under a/c No.PV01/1985, amounting to Rs 14585/-. As mentioned earlier, he had made the payments of bills received under a/c No.PV01/2001 and no bill under a/c No.PV01/1985 was earlier received as there has been one electric connection at his premises and the 2nd connection had ever been existed from the time of our taking over of the said property and had requested to ascertain the correct position and withdraw the incorrect bill, from a/c No.PV01/2001W (now ED-934 to A/c No.PV01/1985-M (now ED-931). Thereafter he had knocked the door of the District Grievances and Redressal Forum and taken the relief of the amount which were earlier charged by the Nigam of wrong account and the amount of sundry charges. Further the Nigam had debited Rs 28548/- in the bill to his account and no action for reversal of the amount debited to his account had ever been taken and penal charges/surcharge of the amount being added to his bill since 31.12.2000. No details of the charges being added in every bill given to the petitioner and reply to his communications made to him till date. Now a bill of Rs 443523 ending 11/2010 has been raised without any details and the amount so refunded as per the order of DCDRF,Gurgaon has also been added in the bill which should be got investigated and orders be passed accordingly..

During the various hearings held , the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition ,stated therein that the disputed case in the name of M/s Sudesh Holding Pvt.Ltd .was decided by the Hon'ble Court of DCDRF, Gurgaon on 9..11.2003.

In compliance of orders dated 9.11.2003, the account of the consumer had already been overhauled for the period from 7/2000 to 0/2006 and a sum of Rs 3,01215 was credited to the account of the consumer in the billing of 10/2006 vide SC&AR No. 12/109R. Now the consumer is

a defaulter of Rs 443523/ ending 11/2010 and there is no dispute regarding billing as the consumer is being billed as per consumption recorded in the meter of the petitioner.

After hearing the respondent SDO, the SDO was directed to justify the details of the amount charged to the petitioner amounting to Rs 443523/- since the accumulation of this huge amount and why the action not been taken on accumulation of this huge amount and the responsibility be fixed . The details are shown in the chart month wise, showing the consumption of each month/bimonthly and the amount charged of the consumption to the petitioner. The amount so withdrawn and the penalty imposed upon the respondent SDO as per the order of DCDRF,Gurgaon may also be explained separately. The status of the amount charged wrongly of another account of ED-934 to the petitioner ,may also be explained on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 20.1.2011.

On the date of hearing i.e. on 20.1.2011, the SDO was present and has submitted that the bills were raised to the petitioner bearing a/c No.ED-931 and ED-934 in the name of Madan Mohan. The petitioner had made the payment of energy bill of a/c no.ED-931 up to the month of 11/98. But during the month of 11/98, both the accounts were closed due to clerical mistake. In the month of 11/99, the account of ED-931 was reopened from IR-17368 units instead of 8069 units as the connection was running continuously. The account of ED-931 was stopped on 8069 units, hence the difference of units consumed by the petitioner for the period from 11/98 to 11/99 i.e. 17368-9299 units were charged for Rs 28548/- in the month of 1/2001. The amount paid by the petitioner against account number ED-934 was adjusted in account No.ED-931 in the billing month of 5/2000. The amount of Rs 28548/- on account difference of units from 11/98 to 11/99 has not been deposited by the petitioner till date. The details of amount payable by the petitioner is as under:-

Principal amount	Rs 28548/-
Surcharge from 1/2001 to 1/2011	Rs 298347/-
Total amount :	Rs 326895/-

Moreover the SDO has further stated that some payment of current bills of various months are still outstanding against the petitioner which are required to be made by the petitioner , as the petitioner had made part payments in many months for which the amount is accumulated to more than 4 lacs against the petitioner. But the petitioner was present and refuted the charge of SDO and stated that no out-standing payment of current bills are pending against him as he had not made any part payments of current bills and the charge of SDO is baseless. The SDO was directed to supply the figures of part payment to the petitioner which was later got noted down figures to the petitioner by the SDO. The petitioner was told to check up the figures of part payment and his payment record and the same be put up on the next date of hearing and he assured that he will check up the figures and proof of payment of all bills shall be shown to the SDO as well as to the Forum on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 24.2.2011.

Today, the SDO and the petitioner were present. The petitioner was asked to show the proof of payment which he had made in the past bills but he instead of showing the proof of payment , he made an another representation which was not found relevant and he had tried to mislead the Forum on one pretext or the other.

After hearing the SDO as well as to the petitioner, it is concluded that since the case is very very old and as per record/details supplied by the SDO, the blunder mistake had been committed by the staff of the sub division while preparing and issuing of energy bills to the petitioner. Keeping in view the circumstances and details supplied by the SDO, the view point of the Forum is that the principal amount of Rs 28548/- for difference of units from 11/98 to 11/99 is charge able to the petitioner by giving the benefit of doubt to the petitioner of mistakes committed by the staff of the sub division, without imposing of any surcharge on the above amount of difference of units calculated by the SDO for the units from 17368- 8069 = 9299 units for the period from 2001 to 2011.

It is ordered that the principal amount of Rs 28548/- be charged to the petitioner by waiving off the surcharge on this amount and the balance outstanding payments for which the petitioner not made fully for many months by the petitioner of the various bills which was got noted to the petitioner by the SDO during the hearing held on 20.01.2011, shall also be recovered along with surcharge/interest from the petitioner up to date. If the petitioner is not ready to make the payment of the above amount, then the Nigam is free to take action against the petitioner as per instructions of the Nigam.

It is further ordered that the SE/OP.Circle,Gurgaon shall also take action against the delinquent officials/officer against their negligence in performance of official duties and loss of the amount of surcharge, waived by this Forum by giving the benefit of doubt to the petitioner for not maintaining the record properly be recovered from the delinquent officials/officer in proportion. The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(V.P.Gupta)
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. 466/2010
Date of Institution:01.12.2010
Date of Decision :15.12.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, 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 received from Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, Hansi, Distt., Hisar against wrong billing.

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

To-day the petitioner as well as the SDO were present. The SDO has submitted the reply vide his memo No.3391 dated 15.12.2010 stated therein that the amount of 2560 units have been refunded vide SC&AR No. 367/144 dated 15.12.2010, amounting to Rs.12570/-. The petitioner was satisfied with the adjustment of the amount.

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. 467/2010

Date of Institution:01.12.2010

Date of Decision :15.12.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, 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 received from Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, Hansi, Distt., Hisar against wrong charges of MMC.

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

To-day the petitioner as well as the SDO were present. The SDO has submitted the reply vide memo No. nil dated nil, on 15.12.2010 stated therein that the TDCO of the petitioner was sanctioned by XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi for the period 15.06.2009 to 15.9.2009 and after expiry of TDCO period, the MMC was charged for the period 16.09.2009 to 16.10.2009. On the other hand, the petitioner stated that he has applied for TDCO on 15.05.2009 for the period 15.06.2009 to 15.09.2009 and his connection was disconnected from the pole on 15.06.2009. He further stated that even after disconnection of his connection from the pole, he had been billed regularly on MMC basis. On his enquiry, he had been told that your TDCO has not been approved by the XEN and thereafter approval of the TDCO, your connection shall be reconnected. On 14.10.2009, his TDCO had been approved and his connection was reconnected on 16.10.2009 after completing all usual formalities. While reconnecting his connection, he had been told that prior to 15.10.2009, all the charges which had been charged by the Nigam will be refunded, but the Nigam is not now refunding the amount of one month MMC for which he had been suffered a lot due to reconnection of his connection by one month late.

Keeping in view the statement of the petitioner as well as the reply of the SDO, the MMC charged for the period from 15.09.2009 to 15.10.2009 are not chargeable and the same be refunded to the petitioner, as the petitioner is not at fault. The delay had been occurred while reconnecting the premises of the petitioner on the part of the respondent SDO. 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. 468/2010
Date of Institution: 01.12.2010
Date of Decision : 15.12.2010

In the matter of

Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, 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 has been received from Sh. Prahlad Rai S/o Sh. Shiv Ditta Rai, Near PCSD High School, Hari Ram Gugal Devi Hospital Road, Out Side Barsi Gate, Hansi, Distt., Hisar against wrong charges of MMC for the period 13.05.2010 to 13.06.2010.

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

To-day the petitioner as well as the SDO were present. The SDO has submitted the reply vide his memo No. 3391 dated 15.12.2010 stated therein that the MMC charged from the period 13.05.2010 to 13.06.2010 has been refunded vide SC&AR No. 368/144 dated 15.12.2010. The petitioner was satisfied with the refund of wrong charges of MMC for the above mentioned period.

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. 469/2010
Date of Institution:01.12.2010
Date of Decision: 14.02.2011

In the matter of
Sh. Om Parkash S/o Sh. Lilu Ram, Shop No.28, Sabji Mandi, 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. Lilu Ram, R/o Shop No.28, Sabji Mandi, Hisar through his Counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate against enhancement of load and billing thereof.

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

During the proceedings held on 12.1.2011, the SDO had submitted that as per the Nigam Sales Circular No.D-62/2000, the load of the petitioner was enhanced from 0.500 KW to 3.00 KW as in the above circular, it was mentioned that those consumer who are living in urban areas with connected load up to 2KW, a uniformly connected load of 2KW be considered for all the consumers. The load between 2KW to 3KW is to be considered as 3KW and load between 3KW to 4 KW is to be considered as 4KW and so on up to 10KW and accordingly, the load of the petitioner was enhanced from 0.550KW to 3KW. The petitioner was charged according to the enhancement of load. The SDO has further stated that the petitioner had deposited an amount of Rs.691/- on 29.04.2009 and thereafter he has not deposited a single penny and Rs.5997/- is outstanding against the petitioner.

On the other hand, the counsel of the petitioner was present and stated that his client had made three Nos. representations for reduction of load but none of his representations had ever been replied by the SDO. His client load had been enhanced by the Nigam at their own from 0.550KW to 3KW., without intimating to the petitioner. If his client had given any application for the load of 3 KW, then the A&A file be shown to him . Moreover, the Nigam had superceeded the Sales Circular No. D-62/2000 and a revised Sales Circular has been issued vide Sales Circular No.D-27/2001. But the SDO has no knowledge of these revised sales circular and SDO is misleading the Forum. When his client has not completed any Nigam formalities for enhancement of load, how can the Nigam enhance the load without completing any formalities i.e. submission of A&A Form and the security of load., at their own. It is prayed that the statement of the SDO is bogus and is far from the truth and may kindly be ignored and the corrected revised bill on the basis of his actual load of 0.550KW may kindly be got issued on the

basis of revised Sales Circular No. D-27/2001. The contents of the sales circular which was shown by the counsel of petitioner are given as under:

It has been mentioned that the Nigam has decided that those domestic and non domestic consumers in urban areas whose connected load is genuinely less than 2 KW and are not defaulters may file an applications with their concerned SDOs /OP. indicating the details of their actual connected load. The SDO/OP .would gets the details verified within 15 days and corrects the connected load accordingly in the record. These connections shall be provided with electronic meters only. After hearing the petitioner, the Nodal Officer was directed to produce the A&A file or any other proof with regard to the contention of the petitioner on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 14.2.2011.

Today, the SDO as well as the counsel of petitioner was present. SDO submitted the reply through the Nodal Office vide his memo No.Ch.13/Forum/469/HSR dated 14.2.2011, stating therein that the sanctioned load of the consumer has reduced from 3 KW to 1 KW as per Sales Circular No.D-27/2001. The account of the petitioner has also overhauled from 6/2010(the date of receipt of consumer request) on the basis of sanctioned load of 1KW and an amount of Rs.5636/- has been refunded to the consumer account vide sundry item No., 168/43 dated 10.2.2011, which also includes the surcharge of the refunded amount. As such, an amount of Rs 6612/- is lying pending towards the consumer. The consumer had deposited Rs 691/- on 29.4.2009 and after that he has not deposited even a single penny after a lapse of more than 1 and a half year. Regarding the bill for the month of September 2010, it is stated that the bill for the said month is only Rs 320/- and the arrear standing against the consumer is Rs 5997/-

After hearing both the parties and keeping in view the Sales Circular, it is ordered that the amount charged on the basis of enhancement of load from 0.550KW to 3KW at their own by the SDO without got completing any required formalities from the petitioner, is not chargeable and the bill be issued to the petitioner on the basis of his sanctioned load i.e. 0.550KW(Say 1KW), which was got sanctioned while taking the connection. The premises be got checked now and if any load is found beyond the sanctioned load, then the petitioner be charged accordingly as per the Nigam's instructions. The stay against disconnection of the petitioner is vacated.

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

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(V.P.Gupta)
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. 470/2010
Date of Institution: 12.2010
Date of Decision :15.12.2010

In the matter of
Sh. Girish S/o Sh. Leela Krishan, H.No.95-A, Ramganj Mohalla, 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 received from Sh.Girish S/o Sh/Lila Krishan, resident of House No.95-A,Ramganj Mohalla,Bhiwani against wrong billing., and enhancement of load to 3 KW by the Nigam at his own.

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

To-day the petitioner as well as the SDO were present. The SDO has submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer, DHBVN,Hisar vide his memo No. Ch.4/Forum-470/BWN dated 15.12.2010 stated therein that the meter of the petitioner was remained dead stop from the date of replacement of defective meter & the billing is done on an average basis w.e.f. 3/2010 to 11/2010 by taking adhoc units i.e. from 2.3.2010. Now the MCO No.74/283 issued to replace the meter and the consumer has supplied his own meter on 30.11.2010 and the same has been replaced on 13.12.2010. The account of the petitioner has also been over hauled provisionally by taking the base of consumption recorded by the meter during 5/08 to 11/08 and Rs 3123/- has been adjusted vide SC&AR No.48/66. He has been directed not to enhance the load of the consumers / petitioner at their own without the consent of the consumers/petitioner in writing and after completing all the usual formalities. If the load of this petitioner is enhanced by the Nigam at his own, the same be reduced to his applied load at the time of connection.

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. 471/2010

Date of Institution:06.12.2010

Date of Decision :09.03.2011

In the matter of

Sh. S.P.Garg, Bharat Metal, 10th KM Stone, 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. S.P.Garg of Bharat Metal, 10th KM Stone, Delhi Road, Hisar against imposing wrong charges of FSA over and above MMC between the period of 5.10.2007 to 7.8.2010. which may please be got refunded.

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

During the proceedings held on 15.12.2010, The SDO had submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar, stated therein that as per the HERC regulation, FSA is chargeable over and above the MMC and PF rebate (if applicable) is to be allowed on MMC + FSA or Energy charges + FSA whichever is higher. In the instance case, initially the PF rebate were allowed on energy charges + FSA through computer system which has been corrected now vide SC&AR No.350/21 and refund a sum of Rs 18437/- has been credited in the account of the petitioner which shall be reflected in the next bill of the petitioner. The copy of reply was given to the petitioner and he was requested to go through the contents of the reply of the SDO and to submit his further comments on or before the next date of hearing which was fixed on 12.1.2011. so that final decision is taken.

During the proceeding held on 12.01.2011, the petitioner submitted that the FSA is a part of Energy charges as per tariff of respondent SDO, as contained in SMI No.5.5 of the Sales Manual. The Sales manual was compiled and published in the year 2005 and there has not been any amendment to this provision of tariff during whole period of dispute.

The very basis of reply of respondent is wrong and misleading as the alleged guidelines of HERC enclosed as Annexure R-1 of respondent reply is only a letter inviting comments/suggestions from DHBVN and annexure R-2 is only an intra office communication of DHBVN. Moreover even any provision of any notification of HERC conferring any right of DHBVN is only enabling & not mandatory in nature and the respondent DHBVNL has to assimilate & incorporate them in its Sales Manual by way of amendment before adversely affecting/charging any sum from the consumers. The respondent SDO may please be directed to refund Rs 152743/- along with the interest, costs & damages without any further delay.

After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was directed to produce if any documentary proof /instructions for charging the FSA on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 14.2.2011, otherwise, the benefit of doubts will automatically goes to the petitioner favour which may please be noted.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO has submitted a copy of Sales Circular No. D-45/2001, wherein it has been clearly mentioned in the circular that in case the consumption of the industrial consumer with the connected load of 10 KW in any month is 200 units, his energy bill on account of sale of power, which is in this would be less than MMC, would be worked out as follows :

MMC=10 KWx200.00	Rs 2000.00
Plus paisa surcharge @ 21 paisa per unit=20x21	Rs 42.00
Total energy charges= Rs 2000/+Rs 42/-	Rs 2042.00

After hearing both the parties, the SDO has failed to produce any latest documents/circulars of the Nigam in support of his claim and the contention of the petitioner is found to be genuine. It is ordered that the amount charged to the petitioner on account of FSA over and above MMC between the period 05.10.2007 to 07.08.2010 is not chargeable and be refunded to the petitioner. The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

(V.P.Gupta)
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. 472/2010
Date of institution 24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Chander Singh S/o Sh. Khunga Singh, Vill. Aghiar, P.O. Pathera, Distt.,
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. Chander Singh, R/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present . The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field . The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 473/2010
Date of institutuion:24.10.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Rohtash S/o Sh. Bhur Singh, Vill.&PO. Kheri Talwana, Distt., 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.Rohtas S/o Sh.Bhur Singh, R/o Village, Kheri Talwana, District Mohindergarh against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present . The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field. The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 474/2010
Date of institution :24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Om Parkash S/o Sh. Moman Singh, Vill. Aghiar, P.O. Pathera, Distt.,
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. Om Parkash S/o Sh.Maman SinghR/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present . The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field . The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 475/2010
Date of institution :24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Krishan Singh S/o Sh. Baldev Singh, Vill. Aghiar, P.O. Pathera, Distt.,
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. Krishan Singh S/o Sh.Baldev Singh, R/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present . The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field . The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 476/2010
Date of institution : 24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Mukesh S/o Sh. Nihal Singh, Vill. Aghiar, P.O. Pathera, Distt., 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. Mukesh S/o Nihal Singh, R/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field . The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 477/2010
Date of institution :24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Phoola Ram S/o Sh. Het Ram, Vill. Aghiar, P.O. Pathera, Distt., 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. Phoola Ram S/o Sh.Het Ram R/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field. The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
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. 478/2010
Date of institution : 24.12.2010
Date of decision : 9.3.2011

In the matter of
Sh.Raj Pal S/o Sh. Samundar Pal, Vill. & P.O., Kheri Talwana, Distt., 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. Chander Singh, R/o Village, Aghiar, P.O. Pathera against low voltage at his tube well.

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

During various proceedings, the SDO/Nodal Officer were directed to submit the detailed sketch of the tube wells connections falls on the feeder from where the supply is being given to the tube well consumers in the area and the progress report of the action taken with the higher authorities regarding the augmentation of the power T/F at the sub station to meet –out the low voltage problem of the tube well consumers, be furnished.

To-day the SDO was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the report of SDO vide his memo No.Ch.9/Forum-472/NNL dated 9.3.2011, stating therein that the 33/11KV 4 MVA T/Fs are proposed at existing 33KV Irrigation Pump Houses Sub Stations which are touching the tale of existing 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders. At present 11KV Pathera and Dhanoda feeders are being fed from 132KV Sub station Kanina. 33KV line is proposed for energization of these 4MVA T/Fs on three pump houses sub stations. The tale loads of village Aghiar & Kheri will be put on these pump Houses sub stations. In this way, the grievances of consumers of this area will be solved after completion of work. SDO has further submitted that the tender No.P&D TED-6/2010 had already been floated for erection of 33KV link line & 4 MVA T/F by SE/Construction ,DHBVN, Faridabad and date of commencement of work is 5.8.2010. 33KV & 11KV link line could not be erected due to hindrance of farmers due to their full growth crops in their field. The work may be completed by the concerned Agency i.e. M/s Aggarwal Traders, Bhiwani after harvesting the crops by the farmers.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and he was told the efforts made by the SDO office as well as the Nodal Officer for augmentation of the power T/F and the system to be laid down in the area for improvement of voltage for meeting out the low voltage problem of the consumers of this area and he was fully satisfied with the efforts being made by the SDO.

Since the work is in progress for improvement of low voltage and the petitioner satisfied with the efforts made. It will take time to complete this work, so there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

File is consigned to record

(V.P..Gupta)
Member

(J.S.Kadian)
Member

(A.K. Tiwari)
Chairman