



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1595/2017

Date of Institution: 16.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 25.01.2017

Date of Order: 25/01/2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member Accounts

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Krishan Kumar Jain S/o Sh. Mahabir Parsad Jain, Toshamia Mohalla, Ward No.9, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

2.SDO/Op. City S/Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.None.

1. Nodal Officer / CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar

2.SDO of City Sub-Division,
DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

ORDER

Sh. Krishan Kumar Jain S/o Sh. Mahabir Parsad Jain, Toshamia Mohalla, Ward No.9, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. B32SC1D-720-A under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the respondent has issued abnormal bill above Rs.70/- lacs in 05/2016. He visited the office of SDO City, Ch.Dadri but no action taken by the Nigam. The consumer requested for correction of his bill as per actual consumption.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 25/01/2017 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 25/01/2017. The consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.137 dated 24/01/2017, stating therein that the bill of the consumer has been corrected and copy of bill attached and Rs.6575/- on account of surcharge also refunded vide SC&AR No. 222/133. The respondent SDO also placed before the Forum, the latest bill of the consumer for an amount of Rs.16470/- after adjustment of sundry amount of Rs.6575/-.

The Forum considered the reply of the SDO and noted that requisite action on the consumer grievance regarding inflated bill of lacs of rupees has already been taken and the latest bill for an amount of Rs.16470/- (23045-6575) duly generated by the system placed before the Forum. The Forum therefore decides to dispose off of the petition. The case is closed. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 25th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1590/2017

Date of Institution: 11.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017

Date of Order: 14/02/2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Global Educational Social Trust, Village, Jasana, Tehsil, Tigan, Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division , DHBVN, Faridabad.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division, Kheri Kalan, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.Representative of SDO of Sub-Divn.,Kheri Kalan, DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Global Educational Social Trust, Village, Jasana, Tehsil, Tigaon, Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C No. JS41-0025 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, Kheri Kalan, DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint stating therein that Global Educational & Social Trust is charitable Trust and running Educational Institute at Village, Jasana, Faridabad. The Trust applied for electricity connection as an educational institute under the category meant for this. The Trust never applied for a change of category till date and using for the educational institute only. He never got any notice in the past regarding the change of category from the respondent office. The DHBVN is also demanding for the penalty since last one year which is injustice with the institute, as he has never applied for change of category. The SDO, DHBVN, Kheri Kalan has disconnected the electricity supply of the institute, which is discrimination with his institute as other institute named IMT, Faridabad is also having the same case but SDO is obliging IMT, Faridabad. So, it is not his fault as he applied and using the same category as an educational institute allotted by the department. Therefore, it is requested that extra amount charged due to change of category may be waived off and uninterrupted electricity supply should be provided to the institute.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14.02.2017. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2524 dated 14/02/2017, stating therein that the consumer has applied for new MS connection vide his office A&A No.23538 dated 30.03.2010 in the name of "Delhi Global Institute of Management" under sanctioned load of 30 KW. The above mentioned detail is verified from the Service Connection Register photocopy attached, as the consumer case file is missing/untraceable, due to shifting of office under police protection from Mawai to Indra Complex. It is also mentioned that the premises of the consumer checked by the Energy Audit team, Gurgaon vide LL-1 No. 2645/25 dated 17.08.2016 in which it is mentioned that the supply of consumer found running under NDS category, whereas consumer billed under LT category connection, due to that change of category case made against the consumer with Rs.169015/- vide Nigam's Sales Circular No. 61/2013. Before imposing the penalty provisional and final notice also issued to the consumer with detailed sheet of charging. A copy of the reply was handed over to the representative of the consumer.

During the course of hearing the consumer argued that they applied for an electricity connection for their educational institute clearly citing the nature of activities and it is the duty of licensee DHBVN to determine the applicable tariff category based on the business activities/usage of electricity. He further argued that the connections are released after due verification by the technical subordinates and monthly readings are taken by the meter reader and periodic checkings of metering installations are carried out by the respondent Nigam

officers as per their rules. The consumer argued that they are a regular paying consumer, never conceal the category of their usage and paid the bills regularly as and when raised by the Nigam. The consumer also argued that they should not be punished for the error on the part of DHBVN officers for applying wrong tariff category in his case and the penalty needs to be withdrawal.

The representative of sub-division was present and argued that the charging has been made as per checking of energy audit and Nigam Sales circular No. 61/2013 and due notices were given to the consumer. On asking for the A&A Form/consumer case file by the Forum, the sub-division representative informed that the consumer case file is not available in the sub-division records.

After examination of the records placed before the Forum and hearing both the parties, the issue has been decided as under:-

1. The premises is an educational institute which is easily identifiable with signboards/ activities seen in/around the premises; however no efforts have been made by the sub-division to rectify the category of usages and billing continued to be made under LT industrial category inspite of monthly meter readings taken by the meter readers and periodic check of the consumer premises and metering installations by the concerned M&P and Enforcement wings of the Nigam.
2. DHBVN Sales circular No. D-40/2014 stipulates that *"in the cases where the consumer has not concealed the category of usage of supply while applying for the connection but the load was sanctioned under a wrong category by the sanctioning authority, only the difference of tariff from the date of connection shall be charged and no case of un-authorized use of supply or theft of electricity shall be made. The future billing, however, shall be made on the applicable category"*.

Accordingly the Forum decides that billing/charging in the present case may be regulated as per para (3) above, i.e. as per Sales Circular No. D-40/2014, by charging the difference of tariff only as no case of unauthorized usage of electricity was made out against the consumer.

The application of the consumer is, therefore, allowed to the extent above. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on other side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 14th February, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1582/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14.02.2017**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-31, Ballabgarh) Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. Indl. Area S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of Indl. Area Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Ballabgarh.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-31, Pali), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 14/02/2017, stating therein that the provision of adjustment of interest on ACD is to be made in the software of RAPDRP. In case the same provision could not be made then the interest on ACD will be adjusted in the billing of 03/2017.

The representative of the consumer was present and insisted that interest on his security amount is to be paid by the DHBVN with or without system. Forum considered the case and observed that the Licensee is under obligation in terms of the provisions of the Electricity Supply Code to adjust the interest on ACD every year as per specified rates. There are provisions for interest payments to the consumer in case of delay. The Forum therefore decides that the interest on ACD deposited by the consumer up to the year 2015-16 be paid by way of adjustment in the energy bill of the consumer for the next cycle if not already paid. With this direction, the application is allowed and closed. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on either side.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1581/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of order: 14/02/2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-34, Pali) Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division, DHBVN, Pali.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Pali.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-34, Pali), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Pali, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 189 dated 08/02/2017, stating therein that total amount of security deposited in these connections are Rs.294000/-. No revised amount of security was debited in these consumer accounts. Interest on ACD for the FY-2015-16 will be credited in the month of March, 2017 and further interest of FY-2016-17 will also be credited in April, 2017 in consumer account.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition with the direction to the respondent SDO to allow the interest on consumer security for FY 2015-16 by way of adjustments in the next bills of the consumer. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1580/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14/02/2017**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No.3, F-23, NIT) Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. City-1 S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of City-1 Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Ballabgarh.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. 3, G-23, NIT, Faridabad), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.3, DHBVN, NIT, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 7825 dated 03/02/2017, stating therein that the interest on ACD in respect of all the 30 No. connections has already been credited in consumer accounts vide SC&AR No. 1 to 30/R-42 which reflects in 02/2017 bills.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition in view of its redressal by the SDO. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1583/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14.02.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-33, Ballabgarh, Sector-58)
Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. S/U S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of S/U Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Ballabgarh.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-33, Ballabgarh, Sector-58), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1489 dated 14/02/2017, stating therein that the provision of adjustment of interest on ACD is to be made in the software of RAPDRP. In case the same provision could not made than the interest on ACD will be adjusted in the billing of 03/2017.

The representative of the consumer was present and insisted that interest on his security amount is to be paid by the DHBVN with or without system. Forum considered the case and observed that the Licensee is under obligation in terms of the provisions of the Electricity Supply Code to adjust the interest on ACD every year as per specified rates. There are provisions for interest payments to the consumer in case of delay. The Forum therefore decides that the interest on ACD deposited by the consumer up to the year 2015-16 be paid by way of adjustment in the energy bill of the consumer for the next cycle if not already paid. With this direction, the application is allowed and closed. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on either side.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

Case No. DH/CGRF-1585/2017

Date of Institution: 11.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017

Date of Order: 14.02.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-32, City-1, Ballagarh) Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. City-1 S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of City-1 Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Ballabgarh.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-32, City-1, Ballabgarh), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. City-1 Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1053 dated 08/02/2017, stating therein that necessary interest on ACD deposited by the consumer in various account as mentioned in the complaint for the year 2015-16 has been given in the respective account as per instructions of the Nigam vide SC&AR No. 144/R186. The correct bill will be delivered to the consumer in the month of March, 2017. The detail of interest given to the consumer account is attached here. A copy of the reply of SDO was handed over to the consumer’s representative during the course of hearing.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition in view of its redressal by the SDO. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1584/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14.02.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-37, City-2, Ballabgarh)
Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. City-2 S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.Representative of SDO of City-2 Sub-
Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-337, Ballabgarh), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. City-2 Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1460 dated 14/02/2017, stating therein that the consumer apply for interest on security deposited in electricity board. The consumer supply list of connections with ACD amount but not mentioned BA-16 receipt of deposit of ACD and also consumer intimated on telephonic discussion BA-16 not available to the consumer. It is further added that he is try to trace out the BA-16 office copies and consumer files for finalization of interest calculation of ACD as per HERC and Nigam’s instructions. It is also requested to direct the consumer that the DOC for given ACD interest without delay to the consumer.

The representative of the consumer was present and insisted that interest on his security amount is to be paid by the DHBVN at its own as all relevant record/consumer master data is available in the consumer file and also in the digitized form the sub-division being fully automated under RAPDRP.

The Forum considered the case and observed that the Licensee is under obligation in terms of the provisions of the Electricity Supply Code to adjust the interest on ACD every year as per specified rates even without any request from the consumer in this regard. There are provisions for interest payments to the consumer in case of delay. The Forum therefore decides that the interest on ACD deposited by the consumer up to the year 2015-16 be paid by way of adjustment in the energy bill of the consumer for the next cycle if not already paid. With this direction, the application is allowed and closed. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on either side.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1586/2017

Date of Institution: 11.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017

Date of Order: 14/02/2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-25, NIT, Faridabad)
Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , NIT, DHBVN, Faridabad.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division No.5, DHBVN, NIT, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of Sub-Divn. No.5, DHBVN, NIT,
Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-25, NI Faridabad), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.5, DHBVN, NIT, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 204 dated 13/02/2017, stating therein that he discussed telephonically for PAN No. but the consumer has not given the PAN No. to his office up-till now. During the hearing the Sub Division representative informed the Forum that they have to deduct the TDS on the interest amount and in case the consumer has not supplied the PAN No. they have to deduct the TDs at higher rates. They have prepared the interest calculations in both the methods i.e. TDS @ 10% and TDS @ 20% in case of no PAN. The reply of the SDO was given to the consumer representative. The consumer was advised to give the PAN details for tax compliance. The representative argued that in case the PAN details are not available with DHBVN the Nigam has to settle their claims by applying the higher TDS rates.

-: 2 :-

The Forum after hearing both the parties decides that the interest on ACD up to the year 2015-16, if not already paid, be allowed to the consumer in terms of the provision of the electricity supply code by way of adjustment in the next energy bill. It was further decides that in case the consumer does not supply the PAN details to the sub-division within a week’s time his claims of interest be settled as mper applicable high rates of TDS as prescribed in the Income Tax Act. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 14th February, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1587/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14.02.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. F-24, J/Colony, NIT,) Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. NIT Division , DHBVN, Faridabad.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division, J/Colony, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of Sub-Divn.,J/Colony, DHBVN,
Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-24, J/Colony, NIT, Faridabad), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, J/Colony, DHBVN, NIT Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1480 dated 06/02/2017, stating therein that the interest on the security has already been given through SC&AR No.76/R83 and amount of Rs.12580/- credited to 11 No. consumers account (list attached). A copy of the reply was handed over to the representative of the consumer.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition in view of its redressal by the SDO. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1588/2017
Date of Institution: 11.01.2017
Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017
Date of Order: 14.02.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint M/s Indus Tower (S/Divn. No. 2, F-22, NIT, Faridabad)
Faridabad regarding non-compliance of HERC orders/billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. NIT Division , DHBVN, Faridabad.
2.SDO/Op. S/Division No.2, DHBVN, NIT, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of Sub-Divn. No.2, DHBVN, NIT,
Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd. (S/Divn.No. G-34, Pali), Building No.10, Tower-B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.2, DHBVN, NIT, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon & Faridabad Operation Circles of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection and security amount is revised also by DHBVN as per his consumption pattern and charged in his bill as ACD charges, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions, Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 67 dated 13/02/2017, stating therein that the interest on ACD for FY-2015-16 has since been adjusted against their relevant account no. as per detail attached and the same will reflect in their next bills. A, copy of the reply of the SDO was handed over to the representative of consumer.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition in view of its redressal by the SDO. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1565/2017

Date of Institution: 02.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 14.02.2017

Date of Order: 14/02/2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Member Technical-cum-Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Bhajan Lal, Village Pehaladpur Majra, P.O. Deeg, Tehsil, Ballabgarh, Faridabad regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

2.SDO/Op. City-1 S/Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of City-1 Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

ORDER

Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Bhajan Lal, Village, Pahaladpur Majra, P.O. Deeg, Tehsil, Ballabgarh, Faridabad has got electricity connection bearing A/C No.AB11-0239 under SDO/Op. City-I Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ballabgarh, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the respondent has issued wrong bill to him. He met with respondent SDO for correction of wrong bill. The SDO called his clerk and asked him for correction in bill. The clerk corrected his bill by writing Rs.565/- to be deposited. He deposited the same and again in the next month wrong bill issued. He again went to the respondent SDO office for correction of his wrong bill. The official has corrected his wrong bill and wrote on the bill for Rs.470/- and he deposited the same. The consumer requested the Forum for correction his bills.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.02.2017 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/02/2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1052 dated 08/02/2017, stating therein that the consumer was debited Rs.30026/- on account of theft of energy as per report of SDO, M&T Lab, DHBVN, Faridabad as per instruction of Nigam and credited Rs.14712/- on account of wrong bill generated due to wrong punching of reading by M/s Hartron in the month of 08/2016. But erroneously the same amount was again debited and credited as above in the respective account in the month of 10/2016. The necessary refund along with interest amounting to Rs.16246/- given in the respective account as per instructions of the Nigam vide SC&AR No. 145/R186. The correct bill will be delivered to the consumer in the month of March, 2017. The details of interest given to the consumer account, is attached here. The consumer was present and a copy of the reply of the SDO was handed over to him.

The Forum considered the case and after taking into account the reply of the SDO and hearing both the parties decides to dispose off the petition in view of its redressal by the SDO. No cost on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

The file be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this date of 14/02/2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Member Technical-cum-Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1559/2016

Date of Institution: 02.01.2017

Date of Hearing: 17.01.2017

Date of Order: 17.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Parwati Devi W/o Sh. Ram Chander, Village, Nangal (Mohanpur), Tehsil, Kanina, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding release of new tube well connection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kanina.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Representative.
2. Nodal Officer /CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Kanina.

ORDER

Smt. Parwati Devi W/o Sh. Ram Chander, Village, Nangal (Mohanpur), Tehsil, Kanina, Distt., Mohindergarh has applied for release of new AP electricity connection under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kanina, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that she had deposited the file in 2014 for release of new tube well connection in the respondent office, Kanina. Her husband is an Ex-serviceman. She requested the Forum to get released her new tube well connection so that she could irrigate her crops.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 17.01.2017 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Narnaul on 17/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.316 dated 17/01/2017, stating therein that the consumer has applied for AP connection under general seniority vide A&A No. 34187/AP dated 24/12/2014. As per Nigam instruction, the consumers who have deposited their applications before or up to 31/12/2013, their connections have been released. The connections for the applicants came after 31/12/2013 shall be released on their turn as per Nigam instructions.

During hearing, the SDO argued that general seniority connections applied after 31/12/2013 are to be released as per Nigam's instructions and Govt. policy. However, in case the consumer wishes to take the connection under Tatkal Scheme, she can avail the facility after depositing the Tatkal Fee and other charges as prescribed by the Nigam. He further informed that Forum that general seniority connections have been released to only those applicants who have applied before 31/12/2013 and since the complainant has applied in the year 2014, her connection cannot be released under general seniority and she can avail the Tatkal facility if the complainant wishes to avail the connection out of turn.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum agrees with the reply filed by the SDO which is in accordance with the Nigam policies. The Forum, therefore, decides that no relief in the present application can be given to the complainant. The complaint is disposed off. The case is closed from this Forum. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 17th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



Case No. DH/CGRF-1555/2016
Date of Institution: 28.12.2016
Date of Hearing: 30.12.2016
Date of Order: 30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Surajmal Educational Trust, 44-A/1, Kalu Sarai, Near Hauz Khas Metro Station, New Delhi (Gurgaon) regarding delay in new connection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S/U Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of South City Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Surajmal Educational Trust, 44-A/1, Kalu Sarai, Near Hauz Khas Metro Station, New Delhi, (Gurgaon) has applied for electricity connection bearing application No. 2478978396 HT/ND under SDO, South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

The complainant has filed the complaint stating therein deliberate delay and unfair practice in handling of his application for release of 1000 kw HT-NDS connection, violation of right to service act as well unnatural delay in acceptance of demand notice dated 23/08/2016, non receiving payment due to blocked ID of SE/Operation since September, 2016 till 27/10/2016. The consumer prayed for direction/permission to accept demand notice payment dated 23/08/2016, DD of Rs.7,50,000/- vide No. 199907 dated 01/10/2016 & DD of Rs.99,787/- of Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. Request for keeping abeyance the unfair recovery of revised demand notice dated 04/11/2016, till decision to meet justice and to save the customer from the grip of Administrative Networking of scam and fraud in Haryana State, violation of grievance norms and law of natural justice and equity as well as policy of transparency in administration.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 30/12/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

Before the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016, the representative of consumer and the representative of the respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 10032 dated 30/12/2016, stating therein that the connection in the name of M/s Surajmal Educational Trust was applied in his office and same was submitted on 18/04/2016 and after submission, the file got sanctioned by the office of SE/Op. on dated 03/06/2016. After that estimate was prepared and sent to division office for sanctioning. The estimate was sanctioned on dated 18/07/2016 and on the basis of estimate sanctioned, demand notice was issued to the consumer on 23/08/2016 for depositing the service connection charges of Rs.7,50,000/- and to complete other formalities as per terms of the demand notice. During the month of October,2016 consumer came to comply with the demand notice along with DD of Rs.7,50,000/- but in the mean time as per sales circular No. D-29/2016 dated 12/09/2016 service connection charges have been revised by Hon'ble HERC from Rs.750/- to Rs.2000/- per KVA/KW w.e.f. 19/07/2016. The revised charges were intimated to the consumer on dated 04/11/2016 for depositing the revised amount of service connection charges. Due to rate revision, his office cannot accept this old demand draft of Rs.7,50,000/- as system is showing Rs.20,00,000/- in lieu of service connection charges. In view of the above, applicant is requested to comply with the demand notice along with revised amount of service connection.

The Forum has gone through the application submitted by M/s Surajmal Education Trust and the papers placed on records by the SDO, South City, Gurgaon on the relevant matter. M/s Surajmal Education Trust has submitted the present application with regards to violation of Haryana Right to Service Act-2014 by the functionaries of DHBVN at Gurgaon i.e. SDO, XEN and SE of Operation Circle, Gurgaon in the matter of dealing with his application for grant of 1000 kw electricity connection under HT-NDS category for their Education Trust. As per provisions of the Haryana Right to Service Act-2014, the XEN and SE OP DHBVN are the first and second grievance redressal designated authority. As per records placed before this Forum, the appeal of the Surajmal Education Trust in the matter has been heard by the XEN/OP (Sub Urban Division) DHBVN, Gurgaon and referred to the SE/OP DHBVN (Second Grievance Redressal Authority) vide his letter No. 15012-13/SUG dated 23/12/2016 with copy to the Surajmal Education Trust. The orders passed by the second grievance redressal authority (SE/OP, Gurgaon) in the matter if any, are not on the records. U/S 10 of the Haryana Right to Service Act-2014, the appeal against the orders of the second grievance redressal authority lies with the State Commission set up under the Haryana Right to Service Act-2014.

After considering the facts on records, the Forum finds that the present application of M/s Surajmal Education Trust seeking direction to the SDO, South City, DHBVN Gurgaon to accept the payments towards the service connection charges at the old unrevised rates is not maintainable before this Forum hence the same is rejected. No costs on either side. The applicant is at liberty to approach the appropriate designated authorities in the matter.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1549/2016
Date of Institution: 22.12.2016
Date of Hearing: 17.01.2017
Date of Order: 17.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Gopi Ram S/o Sh. Ramji Lal, Village, Surani, Tehsil, Ateli, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding shifting of LT Line (2 wires) passing over the house.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2. Nodal Officer /CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Ateli.

ORDER

Sh. Gopi Ram S/o Sh. Ramji Lal, Village, Surani, Tehsil, Ateli, Distt., Mohindergarh has lodged the complaint for shifting of LT line (2 wires) passing over the house which falls under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he has made complaint to SDO, Ateli for shifting of LT line (2 wires) passing over the house and he deposited the estimated cost of Rs.4389/- on dated 16/12/2016 but the respondent has not taken any action uptill now. He requested the Forum to get resolved his grievance.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 17.01.2017 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Narnaul on 17/01/2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4993 dated 17/01/2017, stating therein that as per the consumer representation, a deposit estimate of Rs.4389/- has been framed by his office for which the amount has been deposited by the complainant and after depositing of said amount, the work has been completed by his office.

The consumer was present and insisted for refund of estimated amount in view of the recent announcements from the Govt. to re-locate old dangerous lines passing over the residential areas at Nigam's cost.

The Forum considered all the facts of the case and having observed that the work has already been completed on the representation of the consumer and amount already deposited by the consumer willingly, decided not to re-visit the issue of cost. In view of compliance already reported by the respondent SDO, decided to close the case. No cost on other side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 17th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1551/2016
Date of Institution: 22.12.2016
Date of Hearing: 17.01.2017
Date of Order: 17.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Niranjan Lal,, Village, Surani, P.O. Sarai Bahadur, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding reconnection of tube well connection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2. Nodal Officer /CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Ateli.

ORDER

Sh. Ashok Kumar S/o Sh. Niranjan Lal, Village, Surani, P.O. Sarai Bahadur, Distt., Mohindergarh has applied for AP electricity connection under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he has applied for tube well connection and deposited Rs.1350/-. He requested the Forum to get the estimated cost reduced or get the connection released through cable only so that he can deposit the same with the Nigam.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 17.01.2017 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Narnaul on 17/01/2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4994 dated 17/01/2017, stating therein that as per the record of the complainant applied for TWC connection vide A&A No. 46788 dated 25/01/2012 for releasing of his connection. His office gave demand notice to the complainant vide his office memo No. 1292 dated 25/06/2015, but the complainant has not compliance the demand notice for which his application for new connection has been cancelled by his office. The respondent SDO also placed a copy of demand notice dated 25/06/2015 before the Forum.

During hearing, the respondent SDO argued that the consumer has to comply with the condition of the demand notice within a period up to 3 months failing which the demand notice automatically lapses. The SDO argued that this has been clearly mentioned in the demand notice dated 25/06/2015. The SDO further stated that the consumer has never approached his office regarding the estimated cost and the demand notice was issued as per Nigam's guidelines applicable from time to time as also mentioned in the demand notice itself. As the earlier demand notice already lapsed due to non-compliance of conditions and formalities by the consumer within stipulated time, the connection can now be released afresh with fresh seniority only. The SDO requested to dismiss the complaint of the consumer on the above grounds.

The Forum considered all the facts of the case and agrees with the reply of the respondent SDO that the consumer has not complied with the terms and conditions of the demand notice issued to him in June, 2015 and approached this Forum at belated stage. The Forum, therefore, finds that the complaint is devoid of any merit and decides to dis-allow the same. The case is closed from this Forum. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 17th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1547/2016

Date of Institution: 15.12.2016

Date of Hearing: 20.01.2017

Date of Order: 20.01.2017

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Satnam Singh, M/s Sirsa Beej Bhandar, Vill., Rangri
Khera, Distt., Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
- 2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Madhosighana.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar.

2. SDO of Sub-Divn.,
DHBVN, Madhosighana.

ORDER

M/s Sirsa Beej Industries, Village Rangri Khera, Distt., Sirsa has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. RG-41/0008 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Madhosighana, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent has issued wrong bills in which an amount of Rs. One lac twenty six thousand two hundred fourteen only has been charged in excess. After that the respondent has deposited the same amount in his account. The consumer requested the Forum to get adjusted the interest on that amount which was refunded to him.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 20.01.2017 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Sirsa on 20/01/2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 85 dated 18/01/2017, stating therein that the matter has been investigated and the amount of Rs.13764/- as interest calculated against refunded amount of Rs.112085/- has been adjusted in the consumer's account No. RG-41/0008 (M/s Sirsa Beej Industries, Village, Rangri Khera) vide SC&AR No. 56/433/42 and the consumer is satisfied (consent attached).

The consumer was also present and expressed his satisfaction over the action taken by the respondent sub-division on his complaint. As the grievance of the complainant has already been redressed by the respondent Nigam and the complainant has filed satisfaction, the Forum decides to dispose of the petition without any further orders. No cost on either side. The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 20th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1546/2016

Date of Institution: 15.12.2016

Date of Hearing: 20.01.2017

Date of Order: 20.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Manoj Kumar S/o Sh. Ram Gopal, 430-A, Industrial Area, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.

2.SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar.

2.SDO of Indl. Area Sub-Divn.,

DHBVN, Sirsa.

ORDER

Sh. Manoj Kumar S/o Sh.Ram Gopal, 430A, Industrial Area, Sirsa has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. T11SA12-1210 under SDO/Op. Indl Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent has issued inflated bills for the last two years. He requested the Forum to get overhauled his account for the last two years. He deposited Rs. 50,000/- as part payment according to respondent's guidelines.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 20.01.2017 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held at Sirsa on 20/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 29/IS-CA dated 03/01/2017, stating therein that the premises of the consumer checked by OP wing vide LL-1 No. 40/448 dated 11/08/2016 and found used unauthorized extension of load i.e. 8.767 KW instead of S.L. e.g. 2.060 KW, meter of the consumer removed from the site and packed and referred to M&T lab for its verification.

Accordingly, the meter got verified from M&T lab Sirsa vide office memo No. 3358/3280 dated 18/08/2016 and found reading 49030, both seals are intact, accuracy of the meter checked and found within permissible limit and also reading moves from 49030.1 to 49040.6. Hence, as per lab report and as per checking report, bill is correct and Rs.2400/- charged on account of penalty of unauthorized load vide SC&AR No. 258/149R.

The Forum considered all the facts of the case and noted that the connected load of the consumer was almost 4 times of the sanctioned load i.e. 8.76 KW against sanctioned load of 2.06 KW as ascertained during the checking carried out on 11/08/2016. The Forum also noted that the meter of the consumer found within permissible limit during checking by the lab and bills raised as per consumption recorded by the meter.

In view of the above, the Forum finds no merit in the complaint and decides to dismiss the same. No cost on either side. The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 20.01.2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1541/2016
Date of Institution: 28.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 09.12.2016
Date of Order: 09.12.2016**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Santra Devi, H.No. 590-91, Krishna Nagar, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.I, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/CCC Civil Line Sub-Office, DHBVN, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Representative.
1.Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF,
DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO of Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN,
Hisar.

ORDER

Smt. Santra Devi, H.No. 590-91, Krishna Nagar, Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. K101/9118/4769620000 under SDO/CCC City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that her energy bill raised by the respondent for the last 2-3 years was correct but now her energy bill is coming on higher side. She requested the Forum to get corrected her bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 09.12.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted vide memo No. 6174/76 dated 08/12/2016 stating therein that the consumer visited his office regarding complaint. His office shown the complete previous reading record and tamper data/billing data report to the consumer in which it is clearly shown that in the billing month of 01/09/2016, the MDI was recorded by the meter is 7.78 and the reading was 2553.70 Kwh and cumulative reading was 12208.60 Kwh (copy attached), this shows that consumer was actually used the electricity/electric energy, for which the energy bill was prepared.

The Forum considered the case and finds no merit in the complaint hence decided to dismiss the complaint. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 9th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1543/2016
Date of Institution: 01.12.2016
Date of Hearing: 09.12.2016 & 13.01.2017
Date of Order: 13.01.2017**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. M.P. Bansal, H.No. 120, Sector-15A, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.I, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/CCC Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.None.
1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO of Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN,
Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. M.P. Bansal, H.No. 120, Sector-15A, Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 6703620000 under SDO/CCC Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the respondent raised bill on abnormal in spite of nominal usage and extra-ordinary reading. The complainant requested the Forum to redress his grievance.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 09.12.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016, the representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted vide his memo No. 6171/73 dated 08/12/2016, stating therein that his office had generate the bill on reading base and the meter working is also in OK condition up till now. On the other hand the consumer insisted that the meter reading is on higher side and requested for checking of the meter in lab.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to get the consumer meter checked for its accuracy. The case ius adjourned for next hearing i.e. 13.01.2017.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 13.01.2017. The consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 6814 dated 13/01/2017, stating therein that old meter sr.no. 11583677 of the consumer was checked from M&T lab, Hisar and as per report (attached), meter accuracy found within permissible limit.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1539/2016
Date of Institution: 28.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 23.12.2016
Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.
Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Jeetu Ram S/o Sh. Khubbi Ram, V&P.O. Talu, Bawani Khera, Bhiwani regarding billing problem and for reconnection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Bhiwani.
2.SDO/Op. S/Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.None.
1.Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of Sub-
Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera.

ORDER

Sh. Jeetu Ram S/o Sh. Khubbi Ram, V&P.O. Talu, Bawani Khera, Bhiwani has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. TI1D-405 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera, Distt., Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that:-

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 23/12/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The consumer was not present but the representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4393 dated 19/12/2016, stating therein that the account of the consumer has been overhauled vide SC&AR No. 123/61 in 10/2010 for the average billings charged before 10/2010 and a refund of Rs. 13521/- given to the consumer. No defaulting amount stands against consumer in 10/2010. After that all the energy bills are made on actual energy consumption. The N code given in energy bills has been adjusted already. Only a payment of Rs.4500/- has been made by the consumer from 10/2010 till date. The consumption data from 10/2010 to till-date has been framed and enclosed. Now the consumer has outstanding amount of Rs.79550/- with due date of 12/2016. The Forum discussed with respondent regarding benefit of surcharge waiver scheme, if consumer wants to opt the scheme which is up to 31/12/2016.

The Forum considered the case and directed the SDO to apprise the consumer the benefits of the surcharge waiver scheme of the Nigam presently under implementation. With this direction the case is closed from the Forum. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1536/2016

Date of Institution: 22.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 27.12.2016

Date of Order: 27.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ram Singh S/o Sh. Mool Chand H.No. 842, Sector-3(1),
Rewari regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division, DHBVN, Rewari.
2. SDO/Op. City-II Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1. Present.

1. Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN, Hisar.

2. SDO of City-II Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Rewari.

ORDER

Sh. Ram Singh S/o Sh. Mool Chand, H.No. 842, Sector-3(1), Rewari has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. HU1D-0103 (New A/C No. 6195600000) under SDO/Op. City-II Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent has issued wrong bill since July, 2015 whose amount is in lacs. New 3-phase meter has been installed and single phase meter removed. After that in July, 2015, reading shown in minus but bill raised for Rs.755025/-, in September, 2015, bill raised for Rs.874470/- & in November, 2015, bill raised for Rs.805352/-. In this way, wrong bill issued from last 16 months and he is paying part payments. He is about 76 years old stating that the respondent has not taking any action and requested the Forum to get corrected his bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 27.12.2016 at Rewari for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Rewari on 27/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1569 dated 27/12/2016, stating therein that the billing of the consumer raised abnormal during the month of 07/2015 which has been rectified and the amount Rs.128431/- adjusted in the consumer account. Now a sum of Rs.3618/- also adjusted in the consumer account on account of LPS. The outstanding balance i.e. (-)Rs.3869/- (minus).

The Forum considered the case and reply of the SDO and taking note of the fact that the bill has been corrected and the present outstanding is in minus, decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 27th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1537/2016

Date of Institution: 28.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 23.12.2016

Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Paramveer Singh S/o Sh. Dharam Pal, H.No. 367, Vikas Nagar, Bhiwani regarding metering problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Bhiwani.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar

2.Representative of SDO of Sub-
Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani.

ORDER

Sh. Paramveer Singh S/o Sh. Dharampal, H.No. 367, Vikas Nagar, Bhiwani has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. VD1D-0379 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that his meter is faulty since last one year and he had made complaints so many times. He deposited the amount of check meter but till to-day no check meter has been installed by the respondent. He requested the Forum to get checked his meter by installing check meter and replaced the same.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 23/12/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4557 dated 21/12/2016, stating therein that the complainant has made a complaint regarding checking of the meter bearing A/C No. VD-1D-0379. In this connection, it is stated that the complainant has not given the reference of earlier complaint made to his office. He was contacted his office on 20/12/2016 and 22/12/2016 to represent his case personally in his office for his complaint but he did not come to his office. However, as a Redressal of the complaint SJO No. 2184870892 dated 22/12/2016 (copy attached) has been generated for A/C No. VD-1D-0379 for checking of the meter and meter will be get checked at the earliest in the M&P Testing Lab, Charkhi Dadri.

The Forum considered the case and directed the SDO to get the meter of the consumer checked as per SJO already issued on 22/12/2016 and overhaul the account of the consumer based on the checking results of the meter as per Nigam instructions.

With this direction the case is closed from the Form. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1538/2016

Date of Institution: 28.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 23.12.2016

Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ram Kishan Sharma, President, H.No. 2087, Sector-13, Bhiwani regarding opening of counter for depositing electricity bills.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Bhiwani.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.None.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar

2.Representative of SDO of Sub-Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani.

ORDER

Sh. Ram Kishan Sharma, President, H.No. 2087, Sector-13, Bhiwani has got an electricity connection under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.1, DHBVN, Bhiwani, for opening of counter for depositing electricity bill, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he is paying the bills in sector for the last many years but now no counter is made in the sector while the D.C. Bhiwani was asked the respondent to open counter for depositing the electricity bills in sector on dated 6 to 8 from 9.00 AM to 3.00 PM every month. The complainant requested the Forum to get opened counter for depositing the electricity bills in sector-13 in senior citizens club, Bhiwani.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 23/12/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The consumer was not present but the representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4564 dated 23/12/2016, stating therein that the consumer has made the complaint for opening of the electricity bill depositing counter in Sector-13 HUDA. In this connection, it is stated the energy bill are deposited under RAPDRP system and online payment is made for depositing of electricity bill under real time base system as per Nigam instruction. Keeping in view of the above fact, it is not possible to open bill depositing counter right now. However, online cash less facility is extended for the comfort of users for depositing for the payment of electricity bill on the portal www.dhbvn.org.in.

The Forum considered the case and decided to refer the matter to the SE/OP Bhiwani for taking appropriate decision in the matter keeping in view the need and convenience of the consumers and administrative exigencies/resources available with the circle.

The case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1532/2016

Date of Institution: 16.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 21.12.2016

Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Zile Singh S/o Sh. Surja Ram, Satnali Road Colony, Mohindergarh regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh.

2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN,Mohindergarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar

3.SDO of City Sub-Division, Mohindergarh.

ORDER

Sh. Zile Singh S/o Sh. Surja Ram, Satnali road Colony, Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.AA1D-0805 under SDO/Op.City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that his energy meter is defective due to which the respondent issued inflated bills. He gave in writing to SDO that his office issued wrong bill. The respondent official visited the site and reported that the meter is defective. Instead of that, the respondent issued bill by showing wrong reading in spite of meter defective. The consumer requested the Forum to get correct his energy bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 3469 dated 21/12/2016, stating that consumer bills are generated as per consumption. Ledger copy is hereby enclosed as Annexure-1. Bill for the month of 10/2016 generated up to 11069 units. Energy meter of the consumer was also got checked and found reading 11310 units on 14/12/2016 and meter working O.K.

The consumption pattern of the consumer as filed by the SDO shown that the consumption of the consumer and readings shown are normal except in the month of 6/16 where the reading is shown as 12 only as against the average of 400-500 units in each billing cycle. The reading in the next billing cycle in 8/2016 shown as 1055. The pattern suggests that readings have not been taken properly in the month of 6/2016 leading to inflated bill in 8/2016.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to bifurcate the reading of 8/2016 in two billing cycles with applicable slab benefit and issue revised bill to the consumer accordingly. The consumer agreed to pay the revised bill. With the above direction to the respondent SDO, the case is closed from the Forum without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

Case No. DH/CGRF-1527/2016
Date of Institution: 16.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 21.12.2016
Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Satyavir Singh S/o Sh. Kanhiya Lal, Ward No.9,
Opposite Masjid, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh.
2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of City Sub-Division, Mohindergarh.

ORDER

Sh. Satyavir Singh S/o Sh. Kanhiya Lal, Ward No.9, Opposite Masjid, Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.CT31-0100/SP under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he was taken the above connection in 2007-08 in city Mohindergarh. Before two years ago, the GO-switch of T/F was broken and line was connected directly. He visited the respondent office so many times but no action has been taken. Due to broken handle and direct supply, his factory machines could not running. He met the XEN, Mohindergarh on 23/08/2016 in Open Darbar but no action has been taken and on dated 10/10/2016, the respondent issued bill of Rs.84600/- and connection was disconnected, while the connection should be disconnected within 6 months time. He requested the Forum to get deposited his three months bill and redress his grievance.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.3468 dated 21/12/2016, stating that 25KVA T/F is installed at subject cited connection and G.O. switch is also working properly. Once handle of G.O. switch was broken and same has been replaced.

The consumer's bills are generated as per consumption recorded by energy meter and most bills are of MMC. Ledger copy placed at Annexure-1. Claims of the consumer is not true, that there was no consumption at his connection where as it can be proved from the ledger record, there was regular consumption in all bills since 04/2015 and bill for the month of 11/2016 generated up to 4973 units. Status of meter also got checked by Nigam JE and reading verified 4985 units and meter also working O.K. on 20/12/2016.

It is pertinent to mention that consumer has not made any payment since 25/05/2015, whereas bills are generated correctly and as per consumption. In the light of above, it is stated that claim of the consumer is false and away from facts and nothing is refundable.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum finds no merit in the complaint of the consumer and dismiss the application without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)

Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)

Member



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**

Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1528/2016
Date of Institution: 16.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 21.12.2016
Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Sharma S/o Sh. Lachi Ram, Mohalla, Mali Tibba, Bohroad Road, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
- 2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

- 1.Present.
- 2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar
- 3.Representative of City Sub-Division, Narnaul.

ORDER

Sh. Deepak Sharma S/o Sh. Lachi Ram, Mohalla, Mali Tibba, Bohroad Road, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.2770511111 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaul, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he is paying the energy bills regularly but now the respondent issued bill amounting to Rs.28116/- on dated 15/09/2016 which is on higher side and requested the Forum to get corrected his bill so that he could deposit the same in equal four installments.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.2509 dated 16/12/2016, stating that the bills issued dated 10/05/2016 is generated for units 5494 Kwh for 547 days without reading. After that, the bill issued on each cycle on consumption basis and due to non-payment of bill after 26/03/2016, the amount raises consequently. The reading sheet is enclosed with bill issued on dated 27/05/2016.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum observed that the bill to the consumer has not been raised regularly and bill for 547 days issued in one go. The consumer was agreed to pay the bill in installments and also requested for slab benefit as applicable, the bill being for about two years period. The Forum finds force in the arguments of the consumer and decided that the applicable slab benefit be given to the consumer and the amount of bill as worked out after the slab benefit be accepted in four installments. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side and case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



OR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
No. 01662-223081
www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1529/2016
Date of Institution: 16.12.2016

Date of Hearing: 21.11.2016
Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Kishori Lal S/o Sh. Deen Dayal, V&P.O. Surani,
Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Ateli.

ORDER

Sh. Kishori Lal S/o Sh. Deen Dayal, V&P.O. Sujrani, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.SR51-0542 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that in the last year, the Govt. has declared six months bills wavier in respect of tube well connections of farmers. The respondent has waived off bills of tube well connection of other farmers but no benefit has been given to him under the scheme. He visited the SDO office regarding waiver of bills of six months. The SDO told him that his office has received a list from Deputy Commissioner office in which his account was not mentioned. When he visited the D.C. office, they told him that no list has been issued from their office and SDO misguides him. He requested the Forum to get waived off his six months tube well bills.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4788 dated 21/12/2016, stating that the bill of consumer has been corrected and handed over to the consumer and satisfactory letter received from the consumer is attached herewith.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case and consumer already filed a satisfaction report, the Forum decided to close the case. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1531/2016

Date of Institution: 16.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 21.12.2016

Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Rattan Singh S/o Sh. Rohtash Singh, Village, Kharomi,
P.O. Ratta Kalan, Tehsil, Atela Mandi, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Ateli.

ORDER

Sh. Rattan Singh S/o Sh. Rohtash Singh, Village, Kharomi, P.O. Ratta Kalan, Tehsil, Atela Mandi, Distt., Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.MLDS-0976-A under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ateli, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that his energy meter is working O.K. but the bill has been issued by the respondent on average basis instead of actual consumption. Due to non-payment of bill, the connection has been disconnected on defaulting amount. The consumer requested the Forum to get corrected his energy bill and reconnect his connection.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4789 dated 21/12/2016, stating that consumer has been motivated to make payment in Nigam's surcharge waiver scheme and the consumer is satisfied regarding billing problem. The satisfactory letter received from the consumer is attached herewith.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decided to close the case as per reply received from the SDO along with satisfaction letter of consumer. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

Case No. DH/CGRF-1526/2016
Date of Institution: 16.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 21.12.2016
Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ram Kumar S/o Sh. Kishna Ram, Village Totahari, P.O. Karota, Tehsil, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding reconnection of tube well connection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Nangal Chaudhary.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, Nangal Chaudhary.

ORDER

Sh. Ram Kumar S/o Sh. Kishna Ram, Village Totahari, P.O. Karota, Tehsil, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.218/AP under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Nangal Chaudhary, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he had a tube well connection which was disconnected. Now he has deposited all the pending bills and he is ready to deposit any amount at the time of audit of his account. He requested the Forum to get his tube well connection re-connected.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.12.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 21/12/2016, stating that the consumer is seeking his tube well RCO connection. The site of the applicant was got checked from concerned JE In-charge and reported that the applicant is seeking this connection at new site other than original site. As per Nigam instruction, RCO connection may be released/considered at original/old site only. As per Nigam instruction, no new connection/RCO/Shifting is allowed without permission of committee headed by Worthy Additional Deputy Commissioner, Narnaul. As this location falls in dark zone notified area by the Govt. of India and in dark zone area no bore of tube well or electricity connection is allowed without permission. Hence, this connection cannot be given. A complaint made by Naresh Kumar S/o Sh. Pyre Lal against the subject cited complainant is attached for evidence.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing, the Forum observed that a complaint/court case is pending regarding the ownership of the land between the parties as per copy of the complaint made by another party Naresh Kumar S/o Sh. Pyare Lal filed by the respondent SDO with his reply. In view of the pending court case in the matter, the Forum cannot adjudicate the complaint and therefore dismiss it without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1523/2016
Date of Institution: 10.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 27.12.2016
Date of Order: 27.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Lala Ram Yadav S/o Sh. Ramji Lal, V&P.O. Chhuriwas, Rewari regarding voltage problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division, DHBVN, Rewari.
2. SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1. Present.

1. Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

2. Representative of SDO of S/U Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Rewari.

ORDER

Sh. Lala Ram Yadav S/o Sh. Ramji Lal, V&P.O. Chhuriwas, Rewari has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. TC1D-260 under SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that his & others transformer near Shiv Mandir/Krishna Mandir is overloaded and after one or maximum two months, it is burnt. The persons in old age or the patient suffering from disease are suffered badly. Therefore, it is requested to install a new transformer for domestic supply near the Krishna Mandir at Chhuriawas.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 27.12.2016 at Rewari for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Rewari on 27/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2726 dated 27/12/2016, stating therein that the site was checked by Sh. Sunil Kumar, JE and reported that the site was disputed and his office lodged the FIR vide his office memo No. 2596 dated 13/12/2016 (copy attached). During hearing the SDO informed that there is dispute in the locality and work cannot be completed without the help of the police for which the necessary help has been sought by reporting the matter to police. The consumer present has informed the Forum that he does want to involve in any dispute nor wants his name to be highlighted with respect to any police complaint.

After considering the case the Forum decided to close the case with the direction to the SDO to complete the work with the help of local administration for ensuring proper power supply in the affected areas by replacing the transformer or any other improvement work so required at site The compliance reported through the Nodal Officer in due course.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 27th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1522/2016
Date of Institution: 10.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 25.11.2016&23.12.2016
Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.
Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Shanti Devi W/o Sh. Subhash Chander, V&P.O. Bawani Khera, Distt., Bhiwani regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Bhiwani.
2.SDO/Op. S/Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
1.Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of Sub-
Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera.

ORDER

Smt. Shanti Devi W/o Sh. Subhash Chander, V&P.O. Bawani Khera, Distt., Bhiwani has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. BA1D-0479-A under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Bawani Khera, Distt., Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the respondent's checking team has checked her premises on 22/01/2014 and told her that her meter is faulty. The respondent imposed penalty Rs.30664/- which was deposited by her with the respondent. After 16 months, the respondent raised bill in which Rs.75000/- added. She requested the respondent to waive off the penalty but no response has been received. She requested the Forum to get withdraw wrong penalty.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 25/11/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Bhiwani on 25/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4199 dated 24/11/2016, stating therein that regarding charging of amount Rs.71981/- by private audit vide half margin. As per half margin the billing load of consumer is 5.400. The charging of LL1 32/53 dated 28/01/2014 was made on connected load 2.103 KW Rs.30664/-. The difference amount of Rs.71981/- charged by audit. Then the consumer represent his office that he has not applied for the 5.400 KW load. After checking the records, it is found that as per A&A, the applied load found 0.260 KW, but on a checking vide LL1 No. 17/157 dated 30/01/2006, the connected load found 5.440 KW at the premises of the consumer. Therefore, advice sent to billing section for 5.440 KW in 2006. The consumer is also paying the bill of 6 KW load from 2006 to 2014. The consumer is informed that the charging made by audit party is correct.

The current bill of the consumer was placed on record which shows the connected load as 3 KW hence the reply submitted by the respondent SDO observed to be incorrect by the Forum. The fact was brought to the notice of SDO who admitted that there appears to be some mistake in preparation of the reply and he asked for some time to check the relevant facts and submit the revised reply. Request granted in the interest of justice.

After hearing both the parties and perusal of the records submitted by the respondent and the complainant, the Forum decided to adjourn the hearing for next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply within 7 days positively.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4405 dated 22/12/2016, stating therein that the consumer represent his office regarding charging of amount Rs.71981/- by private audit vide half margin. As per half margin, the billing load of consumer is 5.400 KW. The charging of LL-1 32/53 dated 28/01/2014 was made on connected load 2.103 KW Rs.30664/-. The difference amount of Rs.71981/- charge by audit. Then the consumer represent his office that he has not applied for the 5.400 KW load. After checking the records, it is found that as per A&A, the applied load found 0.260 KW, but on checking vide LL-1 No.

-: 2 :-

17/157 dated 30/01/2006, the connected load found 5.440 KW at the premises of consumer. Therefore, advice sent to billing section for 5.440 KW in 2006. The consumer is also paying the bill of 6 KW load from 2006 to 2014. The ledger copy of bill of consumer showing the load 5.400 KW is also attached. Also the consumer is paying the bills of 5.400 KW for approximately 6 years. The consumer is informed that the charging made by audit party is correct. The advice of 3 KW is sent in 02/2014 on the report of JE as per LL-1 No. 32/53 dated 28/01/2014.

The Forum considered all the facts and noted that the amount has been charged by the private audit party based on the checking report of 2006 vide LL-1 dated 30/01/2006 whereas another checking of consumer premises was carried out by the DHBVN and theft of electricity case was made in 2014 as per LL-1 dated 28/01/2014. The Forum also noted discrepancy in the connected load of the consumer as per ledger records. As the SDO informed the Forum that charging was based on the audit half margin, the Forum decides that the case of current charging by audit may be referred to the Chief Auditor, DHBVN for review of the charging and pass a speaking order within a period of 15 days.

The case is closed from the Forum. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Satish Malik)
Member



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**

IN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

2K, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1521/2016

Date of Institution: 10.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 09.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Mohan Lal S/o Sh. Ami Chand, V&P.O. Arya Nagar, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.II, DHBVN, Hisar.

2. AE/In-charge Sub-Office, DHBVN, Balsamand.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1. Representative.

1. Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

2. JE, In-charge of Sub-Office, DHBVN, Balsamand.

ORDER

Sh. Mohan Lal S/o Sh. Ami Chand, V&P.O. Arya Nagar, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. KR1D-1724-A under JE, In-charge, Sub-Office, DHBVN, Balsamand, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the respondent has issued bill for the period 03/09/2016 to 03/10/2016 in which sundry has been shown which is wrong. He met the respondent office; they told him that the amount has been pointed out by the audit party. They also told him that the HESL employees has shown his meter dead due to which audit para has been made. The complainant stated that his meter is in running condition and till to-day the same meter has been installed at his premises. The complainant requested the Forum to direct the respondent to waive off this audit para and removed the amount from the bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 09.12.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings held at Hisar on 09/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and JE, In-charge of Balsamand Sub-Office were present. The JE, In-charge of Balsamand Sub-Office submitted vide his memo No. 1386 dated 08/12/2016, stating therein that:

1. Meter of the consumer was changed vide MCO No. 96/453 dated 03/07/2012.
2. During 04/2013 meter shown defective (N Code) by HESL personal and billing done on average basis by the billing agency (Hartron).
3. No any complaint regarding average basis bill received from the complainant by his office.
4. During the course of audit, audit party pointed out that meter of the consumer running properly, but bill is done on average basis which is wrong and charged Rs.61876/- vide half margin book No. 2014/185 dated 10/08/2016 after deducting the average units charged from 04/2013 to 10/2015.
5. Working of the meter found OK, checking of present status of meter report attached.

The consumer present has insisted that huge bill has been raised in one go without any fault at his side. Had correct bills were raised to him he would have paid the same timely as he is regular paying consumer and meter installed outside premises.

The Forum considered the case and observed that there is omission at the end of the meter reading agency who shown the bill defective though it was working properly, leading to average billing. On the other hand the consumer should also pay for the energy he actually consumed as per readings shown by the meter which is running as ok. The Forum, therefore, decided that the consumer may be allowed to pay the disputed amount of in three installments besides current charges. The respondent SDO may also take action against the meter reading staff for taking reading in "N" code/showing the meter defective wrongly. The slab benefits if admissible, may also allowed as per Nigam rules.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 9th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
JCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1520/2016
Date of Institution: 10.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 15.12.2016
Date of Order: 15.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Devi Lal S/o Sh. Hem Raj, V&P.O. Ludesar, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. S/U Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Nathusari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2.SDO of Sub-Divn.,DHBVN, Nathusari.

ORDER

Sh. Devi Lal S/o Sh. Hem Raj, V&P.O. Ludesar, Sirsa has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. SN31-1996 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Nathusary, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent have issued inflated bills and removed his meter also. The complainant requested the Forum to get resolved his both grievances.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.12.2016 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Sirsa on 15/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2072 dated 14/12/2016, stating therein that the ledger clerk has checked the consumer account and found that his energy bill is correct as per actual consumption recorded from the meter (detail of consumption attached). The consumer has deposited Rs.490/- on dated 07/04/2015 and after that the consumer has not deposited any bill amount. Due to non-payment of bill, the PDCO has been made by his office on defaulting amount vide Book No. 58/1565. Now an amount of Rs.39567/- is payable by the consumer in the respondent office up to 16/12/2016.

During the hearing, the consumer was informed of the surcharge waiver scheme launched by the Nigam. The respondent SDO agreed to help the consumer with regards to the opting of the SWS. The Forum directed the respondent SDO to cover the present dispute of the consumer in the surcharge waiver scheme presently under implementation as the dispute mainly relates to surcharge due to non-payment of past bills. The consumer who was present also agreed. With this direction, the Forum decided to close the case without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 15th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com)

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1518/2016

Date of Institution: 07.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 25.11.2016 & 23.12.2016

Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Shashi Kumar S/o Sh. Brij Mohan, Rohtak Road, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

2.SDO/Op. City S/Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar

2.Representative of SDO of City
Sub-Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

ORDER

Sh. Shashi Kumar S/o Sh. Brij Mohan, Rohtak Road, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 31/0027 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that:-

1. His consumption is less than MMC but FSA charged.
2. Meter rent charged while he purchased the meter.
3. Municipal Tax be returned because his area is not under M.C.
4. He purchase both the meter i.e. replaced in 2011 and 2012.
5. ACD amount of Rs.7250/- deposited forcibly.
6. He has got connection in first time, his load was 20 KW. After that he reduced load 9.00 KW and requested to refund the ACD.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 25/11/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Bhiwani on 25/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4642 dated 25/11/2016, stating therein that Nigam has introduced scheme of waiver of surcharge, out of court settlement and VDS. There is huge work load on his office to implement these schemes. Due to shortage of staff, huge work load, reply of complaint could not be prepared. The SDO requested the Forum to give next date of hearing so that reply can be prepared. Request granted.

After hearing both the parties and perusal of the records submitted by the respondent and the complainant, the Forum decides to adjourn the hearing for next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply within 7 days positively.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4771 dated 22/12/2016, stating therein that;

1. In his office record, there is no such regulation from HERC which states that no FSA is charged on the bills raised on MMC. If applicant has any regulation of this type from HERC, he may produce the same and account will be overhauled accordingly. All the earlier orders of Worthy Electricity Ombudsman have been implemented by his office.
2. Amount of ACD is calculated as per Nigam's rules and regulations.
3. Meter rent will be refunded after verification of meter details. If meter is provided by the consumer, all the amount of meter rent will be refunded from the date consumer paid meter cost.
4. ACD of a running connection is not refunded. It will be refunded on PDCO of connection.

The Forum considered the case as per the above facts and decided that the excess amount charged from the consumer on account of meter rent if any, be refunded to the consumer after due verification through adjustment in his next bill. With this direction the forum decided to close the case. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

**(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman**

**(Satish Malik)
Member**



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1517/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 25.11.2016&23.12.2016
Date of Order: 11.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.
Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Brij Mohan S/o Sh. Sohan Lal, Rohtak Road, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani regarding removal of electricity line crossing over the land of the consumer.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.
2.SDO/Op. City S/Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
1. Representative of Nodal Officer / CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of City
Sub-Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri.

ORDER

Sh. Brij Mohan S/o Sh. Sohan Lal, Rohtak Road, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani has given complaint in the year 2014 for replacement of broken poles and removal of electricity line which falls under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Charkhi Dadri, Distt., Bhiwani, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he has applied for removal of electricity line which crossing on his land. Some poles are broken but respondent has not replaced the same uptill now. He deposited Rs.120/- in the year 2014 with the respondent which is 1.5% of estimated cost. He requested the Forum to remove the electricity line which is crossing his land and replace the broken poles.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 25/11/2016 at Bhiwani for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Bhiwani on 25/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.4644 dated 25/11/2016, stating therein that Nigam has introduced scheme of waiver of surcharge, out of court settlement and VDS. There is huge work load on his office to implement these schemes. Due to shortage of staff, huge work load, reply of complaint could not be prepared. The SDO requested the Forum to give next date of hearing so that reply can be prepared. Request granted.

After hearing both the parties and perusal of the records submitted by the respondent and the complainant, the Forum decides to adjourn the hearing for next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply within 7 days positively.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Bhiwani on 23/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4772 dated 22/12/2016, stating therein that a new pole has been erected adjacent to cracked pole at the site near Loharu Canal. For shifting of line, it is stated that consumer Sh. Brijmohan Gupta wants to shift this line under self execution scheme. So, an estimate amounting to Rs.36190/- was prepared for shifting of this line. Applicant Sh. Brijmohan Gupta was intimated vide his office memo No. 1629 dated 11/12/2014 about deposition of 1.5% as supervision charges of this estimate. Estimate also sent to applicant and applicant deposited Rs.120/- vide receipt No. 2146772 dated 24/12/2014. Now it was the responsibility of applicant to carry out this work under self execution scheme from class-1 contractor but applicant did not initiated work of shifting of above said line. No work at the site near Loharu canal is pending on the part of Nigam.

The consumer was present during the hearing and insisted that the work be carried out at Nigam cost and he will not deposit any extra amount with the Nigam.

The Forum after considering all the facts and discussions during the hearing found no merit in the complaint of the consumer and decided to reject the same.

The case is closed from the Forum. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 11th January, 2017.

**(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman**

**(Satish Malik)
Member**



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**
CK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbn@gmail.com)

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1516/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Institute of Management & Technology, Near Sai Dhan, Sector-86, Baselwa, Faridabad regarding Non-compliance of HERC Order.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kheri Kalan, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
- 2.SDO of Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Kheri Kalan, Faridabad.

ORDER

The Director, Institute of Management & Technology, Near Sai Dham, Sector-86, Baselwa, Faridabad bearing A/C No. 9012690000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kheri Kalan, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Ravi Hanada S/o Shani Sarup) stating therein that he has applied for same/NDS category due to Educational Institute. He has never got any notice for change of category, using category as allotted by the department. He requested the Forum to get waiving of extra charges and penalty as it is not due to the fault of petitioner.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.1676 dated 09/12/2016 that the complainant of Dr. Ravi Hanada S/o Sarup, Director, Institute of Management & Technology, Near Sai Dham, Sector-86, Baselwa, Faridabad A/C No. 9012690000 in which charging of change of category was posted in the account of the consumer. As per checking report LL-1 No. 002645/000021 dated 12/08/2016, checked by the Energy Audit, Gurgaon team supply found running in the NDS category, whereas consumer had applied under LT category connection, due to which charges for change of category case have been raised against the consumer for Rs.523781/- vide Nigam's Sales Circular No. D-17/2014. The SDO also submitted full details of the case.

A copy of the reply was also handed over to the representative of the consumer. The consumer stated that he was not at fault. The Forum directed the respondent SDO to submit original consumer file on or before the next date of hearing. He was also directed to give necessary documents to the consumer which he wants. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2290 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that the consumer has applied for extension of load on dated 28/03/2001 from 8 KW under NDS category. On dated 23/08/2002 consumer again applied for extension of load from 10 KW to 26.600 KW in the NDS category. The above mentioned detail is verified from the SCO register (photocopy attached), as the consumer case file is missing/untraceable of extension of load 26.600 to 49.900, due to shifting of office under police protection from Mawai to Indra complex and also on due checking of service connection register on entry of extension of load found from 26 KW to 49.900 KW after due checking till 2004. It is also mentioned that the billing of the consumer is running under LT category from 11/2004, checked through the ledger record of his office.

It is further added that the premises of the consumer checked by the Energy audit team Gurgaon, vide LL1 No. 002645/000021 dated 12/08/2016, in which it is mentioned that the supply of consumer found running under NDS category, where as consumer billed under LT category connection, due to that change of category case made against the consumer with Rs.523781/-, vide Nigam's Sales Circular No. 61/2013. Before imposing the penalty provisional and final notice also issued to the consumer with detailed sheet of charging. It is also mentioned that as per direction in the CGRF meeting, a letter has been written to the consumers for applying change of category vide his office memo No. 2236 dated 30/12/2016, but the consumer submitted in-complete file, it is also submitted that due to change over to RAPDRP system , change of category in software is not possible and consumer shall have to apply afresh in NDS category with provision of security.

The consumer was present and pleaded that he rightly applied the connection under NDS category. Theirs is a premier educational institute in the region, the activities of the educational institute are quite visible, there were regular meter readings and checking by DHBVN, they never concealed the category of usage nor the DHBVN has ever raised any notice for any lapse at their end, are regular paying customer of the Nigam as per bills raised and are not to be punished for the error at the part of the Nigam (DHBVN).

The Forum after going through the facts on the record concluded that:

1. The consumer applied under the NDS category & subsequent load extension applications from the consumer were also processed by the sub division under NDS category.
2. The respondent SDO during hearing also confirmed that the consumer never concealed the category of his electricity usages.
3. The premises is an Educational Institute which is easily identifiable with signboards/activities seen in/around the premises, however no efforts have been made by the sub-division to rectify the category of usages and billing continued to be made under LT industrial category in spite of monthly meter readings taken by the meter readers and periodic check of the consumer premises and metering installations by the concerned M&P and Enforcement Wings of the Nigam.
4. DHBVN Sales circular No. D-40/2014 stipulates that *"in the cases where the consumer has not concealed the category of usage of supply while applying for the connection but the load was sanctioned under a wrong category by the sanctioning authority, only the difference of tariff from the date of connection shall be charged and no case of un-authorized use of supply or theft of electricity shall be made. The future billing, however, shall be made on the applicable category"*.

Accordingly the Forum decided that billing/charging may be regulated as per para (4) above i.e. as per Sales Circular No. D-40/2014 by charging the difference of tariff only as no case of unauthorized usage of electricity is made out against the consumer. The Forum also directed that the consumer cannot be forced to submit fresh A&A with fresh charges at this stage and only the difference of tariff and security/ACD as per applicable instructions of the Nigam can be charged from the consumer as the consumer cannot be penalized for misplacement of his case file in the sub division. The system requirements of R-APDRP if any, to be taken care of by the sub division as the same have no bearing on the consumer being no fault at his side.

The application of the consumer is, therefore, allowed. The case is closed from the Forum. No cost on other side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
ARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
01662-223081
(dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1515/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division Kheri Kalan, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
- 2.SDO of Sub-Divn., Kheri Kalan, DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division (WEST), DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Faridabad of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.1676 dated 09/12/2016 that interest on ACD of 22 Nos. accounts will be given in the billing cycle of Dec., 2016 (as per list attached).

The Forum directed the consumer to visit the respondent office and sit-together and settle the issue on or before the next date of hearing. The SDO was also directed to adjust the interest on ACD after checking the consumer records and compliance report submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2289 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein the interest on ACD of 22 No. accounts has given in the month of December, 2016 effected in the billing cycle of January, 2017 (List attached) vide his office sundry item No. R- 102/321 & R-102/90. The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
No. 01662-223081
(www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1514/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
- 2.SDO of Sub-Divn. No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Faridabad of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF that interest on the ACD of 52 Nos. connections will be given in the next billing cycle in the respective electricity bills through sundry and matter will be resolved.

The Forum directed the consumer to visit the respondent office and sit-together and settle the issue on or before the next date of hearing. The SDO was also directed to adjust the interest on ACD after checking the consumer records and compliance report submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 25 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that his office has credited the interest of ACD as per Norm’s of Nigam vide SC&AR No.231/R-200 in various account of the consumers (list of credited interest enclosed). The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

SHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1513/2016

Date of Institution: 07.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017

Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Idea Cellular Ltd., 16/06 M/R, Ojha Niwas, Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division (WEST), DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of WEST Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Idea Cellular Ltd., 16/06, M/R Ojha Niwas, Faridabad has got electricity connection bearing A/C No. 8938430000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division (WEST), DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that the respondent has charged wrong amount in excess billing. He was issued bill of month 03/2014 for Rs.243269/- instead of adjustment of excess billing and excess amount charged through arrear in his account. He was issued last current bill of September, 2016 for Rs.279838/-

The complainant requested the Forum to direct respondent to provide proper month wise billing, arrear detail, all M&P, MCO reports & resolve the billing issue and provide the correct bill as per Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.1517 dated 14/12/2016 that the complainant has made a complaint of average billing and meter shown defective. A letter has been written to XEN/M&P Division, Ballabgarh for checking of the meter vide his office memo No. 1407 dated 22/11/2016. The verification is still awaited. However, reminder has been sent to XEN/M&P Division, DHBVN, Faridabad vide his office memo No. 1511 dated 13/12/2016 for submitting the meter checking report, so that the bill of the consumer may be corrected and the grievance may be redressed.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to get the meter checked from M&P Wing immediately and correct the bill of the complainant. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 50 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that the average billing has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 95/176 for Rs.11142/- after overhauling the account as per the order of the Forum. Hence, the order of the Forum has been implemented. The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**
Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1512/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division (EAST), DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
- 2.SDO of EAST Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division (EAST), DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Faridabad of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.6643 dated 08/12/2016 that the BA-16 No. & date is not mentioned in application of the consumer. His office is also intimated to the applicant through mail. However, the BA-16 will be provided by the consumer, the interest on ACD will be credited to the account.

The Forum directed the consumer to visit the respondent office and sit-together and settle the issue on or before the next date of hearing. The SDO was also directed to adjust the interest on ACD after checking the consumer records and compliance report submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 6799 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that his office has attended the complaint by credit the ACD interest as per Nigam’s

-: 2 :-

instruction for the account as per document received from the consumer (List of detail attached). The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1511/2016

Date of Institution: 07.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017

Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
2. SDO/Op. Mathura Road Sub-Division DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of M/Road Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Mathura Road Sub-Division DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Faridabad of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.2320 dated 13/12/2016 that interest on ACD adjusted in consumer account in the next bill raised to the consumer, after checking the consumer ACD records.

The Forum directed the consumer to visit the respondent office and sit-together and settle the issue on or before the next date of hearing. The SDO was also directed to adjust the interest on ACD after checking the consumer records and compliance report submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 62 dated 09/01/2017, stating therein that the details of ACD interest allowances give to the tower consumers, amount adjusted in their accounts for 12/2016 by his office and same has been reflected in next bill. The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
No. 01662-223081
(www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1510/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 14.12.2016&10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Faridabad (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

3. Xen/Op. Old Division, DHBVN, Faridabad.
4. SDO/Op. Sub-Division (WEST), DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
- 2.SDO of WEST Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Faridabad has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Sub-Division (WEST), DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Faridabad of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14/12/2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.1516 dated 14/12/2016 that the complainant Sh. Deepak Kumar made complaint regarding ACD interest of 37 Nos. accounts. The same has been refunded/posted in the respective account Nos. through SC&AR No. 85/R-176.

The Forum directed the consumer to visit the respondent office and sit-together and settle the issue on or before the next date of hearing. The SDO was also directed to adjust the interest on ACD after checking the consumer records and compliance report submitted on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10/01/2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO is present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 49 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that the complaint regarding 37 No. accounts of pending security has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 94/176 as per the order of the Forum. Hence, the order of the Forum has been implemented.

The representative of consumer also gave in writing that he is satisfied with the reply of SDO and requested for closure of the case. A copy of SDO reply has also been handed over to the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed to his satisfaction the petition is disposed of. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



**FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**

, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

www.dhbvn.com

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1509/2016

Date of Institution: 07.11.2016

Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016

Date of Order: 30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., New Colony, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indust Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC New Colony Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of New Colony Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., New Colony, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/CCC New Colony Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. According to such, an Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolve the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.SPL-1 dated 29/11/2016 that the ACD interest of all cases under this case will be adjusted in next billing. The SDO requested the Forum to grant next date. Request granted.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decides to adjourn the hearing for next date with the direction to the respondent to submit proper reply on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The Nodal Officer has placed on records a list of the details on account of interest paid to the consumer as interest @ 8.5% in his 40 Nos accounts. A copy of the details were provided to the consumer during the hearing. The consumer expressed his satisfaction on the action taken by the Nigam on his grievance.

As the grievance of the consumer regarding nonpayment of interest on the security deposited with the Nigam has been redressed by the respondent SDO as per Nigam instructions, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
LOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
No. 01662-223081
www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1505/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016
Date of Order: 30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Palam Vihar, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indust Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City,Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

5. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
6. SDO/Op. New Palam Vihar Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of New Palam Vihar Sub-Divn.,
DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Palam Vihar, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. New Palam Vihar Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly say as under:-

1.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.Special-1 dated 29/11/2016 that his office has received the above case very late and reply could not be prepared. The SDO requested the Forum to grant next date for submission of reply in this case. Request granted with the direction to file written reply by the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2796/97 dated 28/12/2016, stating therein that the interest on ACD of all the connections of the consumer for which he approached the Forum has already been paid to the consumer @8.5% per annum for the year 2015-16 as per sales instruction No. 1/2016 dated 16/03/2016 vide sundry No. GD-6/70/36R dated 27/12/2016 and the same will be adjusted in consumer’s account in January, 2017 bills (sundry detail attached). The copy of the reply submitted by the SDO was provided to the representative of the consumer during the hearing.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO and interest on consumer security adjusted in the energy account as per Nigam instructions, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1506/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016
Date of Order: 30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., DLF City, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S/U Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC DLF Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of DLF Sub-Divn.,
DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., DLF City, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/CCC DLF Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly say as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolved the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted that his office has received the above case very late and reply could not be prepared. The SDO requested the Forum to grant next date for submission of reply in this case. Request granted with the direction to file written reply by the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2968 dated 30/12/2016, stating therein that the interest on ACD of the consumers adjusted in their energy accounts (list of interest attached). A copy of the reply filed by the SDO was handed over to the representative of the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO and interest on consumer security adjusted in the energy accounts as per Nigam instructions, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1507/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016
Date of Order:30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., IDC, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indust Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City,Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC IDC (New Colony) Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of IDC (New Colony) Sub-Divn.,
DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., IDC, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/CCC IDC Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolve the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.956 dated 29/11/2016 that the ACD interest of all cases under this complaint will be adjusted in next billing. The SDO requested the Forum to grant next date. Request granted with the direction to file written reply by the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO is present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2446 dated 29/12/2016, stating therein that the ACD interest of all cases under this case adjusted vide SC&AR No. 117/BR58, amount adjusted in next billing (List of ACD interest from 2014-2016 @ 8.5% attached). A copy of the reply filed by the SDO was handed over to the representative of the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO and interest on consumer security adjusted in the energy accounts as per Nigam instructions, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1508/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016
Date of Order: 30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Towers Ltd., Kadipur, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indust Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City,Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S/U Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/Op. Kadipur Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of Kadipur Sub-Divn., DHBVN,
Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Indus Tower Ltd., Kadipur, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C Nos. as per list attached under SDO/Op. Kadipur Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indus Tower Ltd.) stating therein that M/s Indus Tower Delhi circle is currently operating 1152 tower connections under Gurgaon of DHBVNL. He has deposited security amount as per DHBVN norms at the time of release of connection, but he has not received interest on security deposited against their electricity connections as per HERC instructions. According to such an Electricity Supply Code Regulation No. 29/2014 and Sales Circular No. D-17/2014 of DHBVN dated 18/04/2014 Instruction No. 4.15.5 clearly says as under:-

4.15.5 Interest on Security Deposit:-

“The licensee shall pay interest to the consumer at the Bank rate or more as specified by the Commission payable annually on the consumer’s security deposit. The interest accrued during the year shall be adjusted in the consumer’s bill for the first billing cycle of the ensuing financial year. The Bank rate shall be calculated by taking average of the Bank rate as on first day and last day of the financial year for which the interest has to be paid”.

The consumer requested the Forum to get resolve the issue and provide the interest amount from the date of Security Deposited or date of connection in all accounts mentioned in his petition (list attached) as per HERC instructions and Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam’s version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 18 dated 29/11/2016, the list of consumers along with the interest given to the consumers as per the Nigam instructions issued time to time. The consumer argued that the copy of the reply be given to him for reconciliation of account. The copy of the reply was provided to the consumer and case adjourned to the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The consumer confirmed the adjustment of interest on consumer security in his accounts for which he approached this Forum.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO and interest on consumer security adjusted in the energy accounts as per Nigam instructions, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1504/2016
Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.11.2016&30.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s HUTCHON ESSAR MOBILE Service Ltd., 39/12 JH, Gurgaon (Corresponding Address : M/s Indus Tower Ltd. Building No. 10B, 9th Floor, DLF Cyber City, Gurgaon) regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S /U Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Representative.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.Representative of SDO of South City Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

M/s Hutchon Essar Mobile Service Ltd., 39/12, JH, Gurgaon has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 3029170000 under SDO/CCC South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint (through Sh. Deepak Kumar S/o Sh. Chanan Ram, M/s Indust Tower Ltd.) stating therein that wrong amount charged in excess against the above account. He was issued bill for the month of 09/2016 for Rs.753652/-, but instead of adjustment of excess billing, excess amount charged through arrear in his account. He was issued last bill of Sep., 2016 for Rs.742990/-. The complainant requested the Forum to direct the respondent to provide proper month wise billing, arrear detail, all M&P , MCO reports & resolve the billing issue. The consumer also raised that MF of the meter is wrongly interpreted causing excessive billing. He requested to resolve the issue and provide the correct bill as per Nigam instructions.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/11/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016, the representative of consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The representative of respondent SDO submitted that the request for correction of MF has been generated and as and when the MF corrected by the JE, Area In-charge, the bill of the consumer would be corrected accordingly and delivered to the consumer. The respondent SDO asked for the next date to file the final compliance report. Request granted. The representative of consumer requested the Forum to direct the respondent to reconnect his connection. The Forum decides to adjourn the hearing for next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to accept the current energy charges and restore the connection of the consumer till the petition of the consumer is finally disposed of by this Forum. The SDO was further directed to file the final reply covering all the aspects of the complaint on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 30/12/2016. The representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted supplementary reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 10031 dated 30/12/2016, stating therein that as per order of Forum, MF of the consumer has been corrected from 1 to 0.3 and bills of the consumer revised with new MF and copy of correct bill attached. A copy of the reply with corrected bill was handed over to the representative of the consumer.

As the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO and bill revised by applying the correct MF which was handed over to the representative of the consumer during the hearing, the Forum decided to close the case. No cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 30th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member

Case No. DH/CGRF-1503/2016

Date of Institution: 07.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 08.11.2016&09.12.2016
Date of Order: 09.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.
Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Joginder Singh, Shanti Niketan Colony, Near Hyundai Agency, Hansi, Distt., Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi.
2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hansi.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.None.
1.Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF,
DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Hansi.

ORDER

Sh. Joginder Singh, Shanti Niketan Colony, Near Hyundai Agency, Hansi, Distt., Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 3354222222 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hansi, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he has made a complaint to the respondent that his meter was burnt in 04/2016. At his premises light has been disconnected and he has a generator at his premises and arranged light through his generator. But the respondent has issued bill to him inspite of no electricity supply. The respondent has replaced his meter in 07/2016 and he deposited Rs.30000/- after replacement of meter. He requested the Forum to direct the respondent to issue bill for the month of 04/2016 to 06/2016 on MMC basis because he has not used any electricity and overhaul his bill on the basis of new meter consumption.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 08.11.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The representative of SDO stated that due to late receipt of complaint, his office could not prepare the reply and requested for next date. Request granted. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016. The consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The respondent SDO submitted vide his memo No. 1713 dated 08/12/2016, stating therein that the bill has been set right (copy of energy bill attached) through SC&A.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decides to close the case as the bill of the consumer has been set right by the respondent SDO through sundry and grievance of the consumer has been redressed. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 9th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member

Case No. DH/CGRF-1500/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 22.11.2016&27.12.2016
Date of Order: 27.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Samunder Singh S/o Sh. Roop Chand, Durga Colony, Rewari regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division, DHBVN, Rewari.
2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division No.1, DHBVN, Rewari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2.SDO of City Sub-Divn. No.1, DHBVN, Rewari.

ORDER

Sh. Samunder Singh S/o Sh. Roop Chand, Durga Colony, Rewari has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. YYID-0415 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division No.1, DHBVN, Rewari, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent has issued wrong bill and requested the Forum to waive off his surcharge and correction of wrong bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 22.11.2016 at Rewari for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Rewari on 22/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The complaint of the consumer was not complete and the consumer has submitted copy of the complaint which has been handed over to the SDO. The SDO stated that he could not prepare the reply as the complaint of the consumer was not complete. The SDO stated that he will submit reply on or before the next date of hearing. The case was adjourned for the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Rewari on 27/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1479 dated 27/12/2016, stating therein that after scrutiny of consumer account, it is find that no adjustment in favour of consumer is admissible, hence the complaint of the consumer may be disposed off.

The Forum considered the case and no find no merit in the complaint hence decided to close the same. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 27th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

Case No. DH/CGRF-1498/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 22.11.2016&27.12.2016
Date of Order: 27.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Satpal S/o Sh. Gyarsi Ram, Village, Chandpur, P.O. Bitwana, Tehsil & Distt., Rewari regarding voltage problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division, DHBVN, Rewari.
2.SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2. SDO of S/U Sub-Divn. DHBVN, Rewari.

ORDER

Sh. Satpal S/o Sh. Gyarsi Ram, Village, Chandpur, P.O. Bitwana, Tehsil & Distt., Rewari has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. TC1D-1412-A under SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that a T/F is already installed near Sunil Dairy which is running on overload due to which a phase gets burnt. Due to overload of T/F, the consumer is not getting proper supply. The consumer has requested the Forum to get installed another T/F so that they can receive proper voltage.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 22.11.2016 at Rewari for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Rewari on 22/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO stated that the case has been received late due to which his office could not prepare the reply. He requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for the next date. Request granted and case adjourned for the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Rewari on 27/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2725 dated 27/12/2016, stating therein that six Nos. 9 mtrs. Poles already erected and LT AB cable 120+70 MM & PCC pole 11 mtrs. not available in the store (N.A. copy attached). During discussions it was informed by the SDO that the work for improvement of voltage already started by installing 9 M poles and the remaining material is being sourced from the Store and work likely to be completed soon.

The Forum after taking note of the status of work, decided to close the case with the direction to the SDO to complete the work within a month's time and ensure proper voltage to the consumer. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 27th. December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1499/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 22.11.2016&27.12.2016
Date of Order: 27.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Harpal Singh S/o Sh. Ram Lal Yadav, Village, Mandhiya Kalan, P.O. Majra Sheoraj, Tehsil & Distt., Rewari regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division, DHBVN, Rewari.
2.SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2. SDO of S/U Sub-Divn. DHBVN, Rewari.

ORDER

Sh. Harpal Singh S/o Sh. Ram Lal Yadav, Village, Mandhiya Kalan, P.O. Majra Sheoraj, Tehsil & Distt., Rewari has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. HH1D-3642-X under SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Rewari, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he has deposited Rs.3000/- on 21/09/2015 but the respondent Nigam has not released his connection uptill now. Suddenly, respondent has issued bill amounting to Rs.1431/- against A/C No. HH1D-3642-X showing two months fixed 240 units. He informed the respondent SDO on dated 11/02/2016 then the respondent has installed the meter on pole outside the premises without any information or taking any receipt from him. He wrote a letter to the respondent on 15/02/2016 by registered post regarding withdrawing the bill but no action has been taken by the respondent. He again lodged complaint on Customer Care Centre helpline No. 18001804334 dated 05/08/2016 and the CCC has replied that his grievance has been redressed but nothing has been done in this regard. He wrote letter to M.D., DHBVN, Hisar on 09/08/2016 but no action has been taken uptill now. The consumer requested the Forum to get his grievance redressed and take action against delinquent officers/officials.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 22.11.2016 at Rewari for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings were held at Rewari on 22/11/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO stated that the case was received late due to which his office could not prepare the reply. He requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing on the next date. Request granted.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Rewari on 27/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2615 dated 19/12/2016, stating therein that the consumer had deposited Rs.3000/- as ACD+PC+M.COST on dated 21/09/2015. After that the connection was released on 29/10/2015 and master file filled up during the month of 01/2016 due to even month for issuing the bill and the first bill was issued to the consumer

-: 2 :-

During the month of 02/2016 on average basis due to 1st bill and after that the bill was rectified by his office vide SC&AR No. 274/R-60 for Rs.436/- was adjusted in the consumer account. Hence the grievance of the consumer was already been redressed and no officer/official was responsible for this complaint.

During the course of hearing the consumer informed that his meter data in bill not yet corrected. The consumer also insisted to inform him the names of the officials who erred in his case and issued wrong bills. The consumer was told that in case he wants any specific information the same can be sought under RTI. The Forum after taking note of the reply of the SDO and refund allowed in the bill as reported by the SDO decided to close the case with the direction to the SDO to correct the master data of the consumer in the system within period of 15 days. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 27th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
DCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone No. 01662-223081
Website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1497/2016

Date of Institution: 27.10.2016.

Date of Hearing: 04.11.2016&06.12.2016

Date of Order: 06.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Dalchand S/o Sh. Chajjan Lal, H.No. 120/1, Tuhiram Colony, Palwal regarding billing problem.

....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Palwal.
2.SDO/Op City Sub-Division, DHBVN,Palwal.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Present.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of City Sub-Division, Palwal.

ORDER

Sh. Dalchand S/o Sh. Chajjan Lal, H.No. 120/1, Tuhiram Colony, Palwal has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. EE12-1949 (New A/C No. 7122411111) under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Palwal, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he had taken an electricity connection in the name of Sh. Makhan Lal whose Account No. was NO12-1418 which was disconnected by him and Rs.2715/- to be refunded to him. But the respondent has not refunded the same uptill now. He requested the Forum to adjust the same in his new A/C No. EE-12-1949.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 04.11.2016 at Palwal for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Palwal on 04/11/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO could not submit the reply due to late receipt of complaint.

The Forum directed the representative of SDO to refund/adjust the amount of Rs.2715/- to the consumer in the another account which has been given in application of the consumer and after doing the needful, the report compliance of the case on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Palwal on 06/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 959 dated 06/12/2016, stating therein that the connection of A/C No. 7122411111 in the name of Sh. Makhan Lal disconnected on consumer request. The final bill of the consumer after entered of PDCO of Rs.2715/-. Sh. Dal Chand R/o Tuhi Ram Colony submitted for refund of above account and adjustment of above amount in his A/C No. EE12-1949, which is against the Nigam rule. The same amount can only be adjusted in the same name consumer or refund to him by cheque on request of original consumer. At this time, the above account has been closed and not in open stage in the RAPDRP system.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, since the consumer Sh. Makhan Lal has expired, as such the refund of Rs.2715/- may be paid to his legal heir after obtaining the death certificate and succession certificate and completing other paper formalities. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side and case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 6th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Satish Malik)
Member



BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN

FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1492/2016

Date of Institution: 27.10.2016

**Date of Hearing: 08.11.2016, 09.12.2016 &
13.01.2017**

Date of Order: 13.01.2017.

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Sanjay Kumar S/o Sh. Ishwar Singh, V&P.O. Kanheri, Tehsil, Tohana, Distt., Fatehabad regarding removal of DS connection of Sh. Krishan Kumar from the AP Line/Transformer.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Tohana.

2. SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Tohana.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1. Present.

1. Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

2. SDO/Op. Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Tohana.

ORDER

Sh. Sanjay Kumar S/o Sh. Ishwar Singh, V&P.O. Kanheri, Tehsil, Tohana, Distt., Fatehabad has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. SF51-0829 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Tohana, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he has a tube well connection bearing A/C No. SF-51-0829 and he is paying the bill every month regularly. He has taken the AP connection in self execution scheme and paid all the payment of T/F and other equipments. But the respondent has released a domestic connection to his field neighbour Sh. Krishan Kumar S/o Sh. Parkash with the connivance of Sh. Krishan Kumar. He has made complaints to the respondent SDO but no action has been taken uptill now. He also stated that according to Nigam's rules, no connection could be released from AP line which is erected in the self execution scheme. He requested the Forum to get disconnected the above said domestic connection immediately and take action against SDO, JE & Lineman as per Nigam's rule.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 08.11.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the consumer is present but the respondent SDO nor his representative was present. The respondent SDO sent email through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 1812 dated 04/11/2016 stating therein that his office has received complaint on email on dated 03/11/2016 and his office could not prepare the reply. He requested the Forum for next date. Request granted.

During the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016, the consumer was present but the respondent SDO was not present and he submit e-mail vide his memo No. 1994 dated 09/12/2016 that he has posted in this sub-division recently and the details/complete matter of the case was not in the notice of undersigned. He requested the Forum to allow next date for submission of reply after proper study of the case, inspection of site and relevant record etc.

The Forum took a serious note of the casual attitude of the SDO in handling the case and non submission of the reply on two successive dates. The Forum directed that written statement of the SDO be filed to the Forum on or before the next date otherwise costs shall be imposed besides deciding the case exparte with entire consequences on the SDO. The Nodal Officer is also directed to take up the matter at his level with appropriate authorities and ensure written submissions of the SDO before the next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 13.01.2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.30/2017 dated 10/01/2017 stating therein that the complaint was checked and site was got checked for area incharge of Sh. Naveen Kumar, JE-F and it was observed that the complaint made by Sh. Sanjay Kumar of village Kanheri seems genuine and it was observed that the connection bearing A/C No. SK1D-0836 DS in the name of Sh. Krishan Kumar was got released wrongly as such the T/F installed at that site for AP purpose and having connectivity from Kanheri AP feeder.

Further, it is pertinent to mention that the account holder SK1D-0836 DS i.e. Sh. Krishan Kumar is also the regularly pay the electricity bill and there is no nearby domestic supply for providing electricity to him.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN

FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Block, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Phone No. 01662-223081

Website: www.dhbvn.com

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1489/2016

Date of Institution: 05.10.2016

**Date of Hearing: 10.10.2016, 08.11.2016,
09.12.2016 & 13.01.2017**

Date of Order: 13.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Kewal Chand Jain C/o M/s Jai Durge M.S. Rice Mills,
203, Anaj Mandi, Ratia, Fatehabad regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Fatehabad.

2. SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ratia.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1. None.

1. Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

2. SDO/Op. City Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Ratia.

ORDER

Sh. Kewal Chand Jain C/o M/s Jai Durga M.S. Rice Mills, 203, Anaj Mandi, Ratia, Fatehabad has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. C-141-0011A MS-13 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Ratia, Fatehabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that his factory was closed. For the period of 01.03.2016 to 03.04.2016 his consumption in Kwh was (8x20)=160 units and in KVAH it was (335x20)= 6700 units. The respondent issued bill of 6700 units for Rs.42175/- which is wrong and requested the Forum to withdraw the same.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 10.10.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the consumer was present but the respondent SDO was not present.

The hearing was adjourned to the next date due to non presence of the respondent with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply on the next date of hearing otherwise cost will be imposed.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 1597 dated 08/11/2016 stating therein that Sh. Kewal Chand Jain bearing A/C No.C141-0011 of M/s Jai Durga Rice Mill with sanctioned load 67.700 KW. The meter was checked and changed by M&P wing Hisar vide Book No. 52/395 (copy enclosed) on dated 04/05/2016 and further recommended that meter be got tested from M&T lab, Hisar for checking of accuracy and seal sample. The M&T lab, Hisar intimated/reported vide its Sr. No. 31 on dated 23/10/2016 (copy enclosed) & the meter found within permissible limit. The copy of load survey data is also enclosed. The charging made as per M&T lab report is genuine and as per prevailing Nigam instruction.

After going through the facts, the Forum observed that the consumption in KVAH was abnormally high i.e. 6700 units compared to KWH consumption of 160 units during the period under dispute i.e. 01/3/2016 to 03/04/2016. The respondent SDO has not submitted any specific reply/documents to support this high consumption in KVAH. The Forum, therefore, directed the respondent SDO to furnish specific reply/comments on this aspect during at the time of next hearing. The case was adjourned for next hearing.

During the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted a letter written to SDO/M&T Lab., Hisar vide memo No. 1709 dated 08/12/2016 stating that the specific comments on the subject have been asked for from the M&T Lab, Hisar and the same are awaited. The SDO requested time for filing detailed technical reasons. Request granted and case posted for next date i.e. 13/01/2017.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 13.01.2017. The consumer was not present but respondent SDO was present.

(Atul Pasrija)

Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)

Member

(Satish Malik)

Member

BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN

JM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

HIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

OCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

hone No. 01662-223081

site: www.dhbvn.com

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)



Case No. DH/CGRF-1488/2016

Date of Institution: 05.10.2016

Date of Hearing:10.10.2016,08.11.2016

&09.12.2016

Date of Order: 09.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Madan Lal, H.No. 52, BHP Colony, V&P.O. Satrod, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.II, DHBVN, Hisar.
- 2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

2.SDO/Op. Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. Madan Lal, H.No. 52, Block-B, BHP Colony, V&P.O. Satrod, Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 7825770000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he had made a request to SDO/Op. Sub-Division, Satrod on 29/08/2016 regarding checking of energy meter installed at pole for his premises, as the meter was running fast; resulting into heavy amount of bill. The energy meter was got checked by the ALM as per directions of SDO/JE. The ALM reported that normally the meter blinks 6 times in one minute but this meter is blinking 8 times in one minute. It means that the meter is running fast (Photo copy of report is enclosed for reference). He has 3 KW load in his house and mostly LED bulbs are being used since long. In spite of that heavy amount of bill of Rs.18434/- for 2037 units (new reading of bill is 11829 and old reading was 9792) was issued for the period i.e. 14.07.2016 to 02.09.2016 for 50 days. The photo copy of bill is enclosed. The meter was installed about two years before and never in the past so heavy amount of bills were issued. It is, however, informed that the said meter was replaced on 06/09/2016 on 12689 readings. The bill for 860 units consumption (12689-11829=860 only in 4 days) of old meter is to be issued by the sub-division.

He requested the Forum to direct the SDO concerned to overhaul the account for the period of old meter replaced on 06/09/2016 on the basis of consumptions of the corresponding months of previous year being domestic supply.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 10.10.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 3590-91/Court Case/ST dated 10/10/2016 that the complaint was received in his office on 06/10/2016 and reply could not be prepared due to late receipt of complaint and requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for next date.

After hearing both the parties, the SDO was directed to submit proper reply on the next date of hearing to avoid imposition of cost. He was also directed to get the meter checked from M&T lab and submit the Forum the report of checking. Besides, he was also directed to produce to the Forum the consumption pattern for the last one year.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. SPL-1/ST/HSR dated 08/11/2016, stating therein that:-

1. The meter of the consumer got replaced vide MCO No. 01/24 dated 09/10/2013 affected on 12/11/2013.
2. The account of the consumer was overhauled after MCO and a sum of Rs.23767/- was adjusted in consumer account vide SC&AR No. 42/53 and same was post in consumer account in 06/2014.

3. The meter again replaced vide MCO No. 63/708 dated 05/09/2016 affected on 06/09/2016 being dead stop.
4. Sh. Amarjeet Singh, JE(F) returned the same/removal meter to the M&T lab, DHBVN, Hisar vide his office Challan No. 3060-61 dated 14/09/2016 in which 27 Nos. meter were returned and meter of complainant was included in the same.
5. On 10/10/2016, the Forum gave direction to the respondent to get checked the electricity meter into M&T lab, DHBVN, Hisar. In compliance of direction of dated 10/10/2016, his office served a notice to the consumer for checking the meter in M&T lab, Hisar vide his office memo No. 3736-38 dated 17/10/2016 and memo No. 3917 dated 27/10/2016 but the complainant refused to remove his electricity meter from his premises and checking of the meter from M&T lab.

In view of above facts and submission, it is, therefore, prayed that the application of the applicant may be dismissed without cost.

A copy of the reply is handed over to the consumer. The consumer submitted replication stating therein that:-

1. The meter was replaced vide MCO No. 1/24 dated 09/11/2013 affected on 12/11/2013 is totally irrelevant to the dispute. The dispute is in fact relates to the bill No. 782573694587 issued on 08/09/2016. He accepted all the previous bills as correct and makes the payments promptly. However, the bill dated 08/09/2016 which was issued for the consumption of 2037 units was abnormally high and unjustified. As such, was objected and challenged by the applicant. The reply submitted by the respondent SDO is irrelevant and have been submitted to mislead the Forum.
2. The reply of respondent SDO is uncompleted and the actual facts which lead to replacement of meter on 06/09/2016 have been concealed. In fact aggrieved with the bill dated 08/09/2016, he made complaint to the respondent SDO on dated 29/08/2016 which was marked to Sh. Amarjit Singh, JE for checking of the meter. Sh. Amarjit Singh, JE deputed Sh. Surender, ALM for checking of meter and he reported the working of meter as blinking on 8imps. In one minute on load of 100 watts of bulb. He failed to mention the exact working of the meter on the report. Though, he admitted that the meter is running fast. Thereafter, the meter was replaced vide MCO No. 63/708 dated 05/09/2016 affected on 06/09/2016. It is pertinent to brought into the notice of Forum that the meter was not declared as dead-stop at the time of checking but the reasons of change for the meter was shown as dead-stop on the MCO. It is totally incorrect. The reading as on 14/07/2016 was 9792, on 02/09/2016 reading was 11829 and on 31/08/2016 (at the time of checking), the reading was 12577 and reading on 06/09/2016 was 12689. As such, the question of meter being dead-stop does not arise.

From the above facts, it is crystal clear that the proper checking of meter was not carried out with the instructions laid by the Nigam, in this regard, were violated and the meter was replaced by showing incorrect reasons.

3. He requested the representative of JE/SDO not to remove the meter because working of meter was not disputed and checking of meter has not relevance with the disputed bill.

Besides above, it is submitted to the Forum that the consumptions of the old disputed meter for the period of 4 days i.e. 02/09/2016 to 06/09/2016 have been shown as 860 units, which is not possible for a domestic connection having load of just 3 KW. This fact was brought into the notice of SDO in person, as such, it was expected from him that the working of the meter is carried out instrumentally or installing a proper check meter but the meter was replaced showing the same as dead-stop.

It is, therefore, humbly requested that the orders may be issued to overhaul the account for the period 14/07/2016 to the date of replacement of meter i.e. 06/09/2016 on the basis of average consumption of corresponding month of the previous year as per rule and regulations of the Nigam.

During the proceedings held on 9/12/2016 the consumer as well as SDO was present. The consumer while relying upon his written submissions requested to overhaul his account for the period 14/07/2016 onwards whereas on the other hand the respondent SDO insisted that the action taken by the Nigam in the case is as per consumption actually recorded by the meter.

After hearing both the parties and records placed before the Forum it was observed that there are some inconsistencies in the version of the Nigam as follows:

1. As per meter checking carried out by Sh. Surender ALM on dated 31/08/2016, on behalf of Sh. Amarjeet JE as per directions of the SDO the reading of meter was mentioned as 12577 without any comments on the working of the meter.
2. As per bill for the month of 9/2016 the reading of the meter was shown as 11929 on 2/09/2016 which cannot be correct as the reading on the actual checking on 31/08/2016 i.e. 2 days ago was recorded as 12577 by the ALM at consumer premises.
3. On 6/09/2016 at the time of the removal of the disputed meter, the reading was shown as 12689. The consumption therefore shown as 860 units (12689-11829) in 4 days with 3 KW sanctioned load which is higher by all standards. The meter was removed and replaced vide MCO No. MCO No. 63/708 dated 05/09/2016.
4. As per letter dated 14/09/2016 from the Sub Divn. To the AEE/ M&T, Lab, DHBVN Hisar through which the defective/dead stop meters have been returned, the disputed meter of the consumer (SR. 5660175) at Sr. 4 of the ibid letter with reading at 12689 has been shown as "D/Stop" in the remarks column by the JE I/C of the sub division.
5. The meter was never got checked from the lab and it was stated that the same was returned as scrap. The consumer contended that it should have been got checked from the M&P lab in a proper manner as it was showing consumption and not dead stop as claimed by the respondent SDO.
6. The respondent sub division has not submitted any fact on record as to how the meter was not checked in the lab and disposed of as scrap by declaring dead stop ignoring the dispute already raised by the consumer.

-: 4 :-

After considering all the contradictory facts as above and other records placed before it, the Forum is of the opinion that the working of the meter was not proper. As the meter in dispute stated to have already been disposed as scrap, there is no other alternative except to overhaul the consumers account for the disputed period i.e. 14/07/2016 to 6/09/2016 (54 days) based on the consumption recorded during the corresponding period or average of the last six months or on the basis of the consumption recorded by the new meter installed on 6/09/2016 to meet the end of justice.

The case is closed from the Forum without costs to either side.
File consigned to the record.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)**

**Case No. DH/CGRF-1484/2016
Date of Institution: 26.09.2016
Date of Hearing: 10.10.2016 & 08.11.2016
Date of Order: 08.11.2016**

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. M.M.Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Rati Ram Aggarwal C/o Shree Balaji Gaushala Samiti, Mangali, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.II, DHBVN, Hisar.
- 2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

- 1.Representative.
- 1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.
- 2.Representative of SDO/Op. Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. Rati Ram Aggarwal C/o Shree Balaji Gaushala Samiti, Mangali, Distt., Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. MM11-2294A under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that the SDO, Satrod Sub-Division vide memo No. 16862 and 16891 dated 20/01/2015 has raised a demand of Rs.304231/- and Rs.66150/- respectively, stating that the registered Gaushala's are liable to pay normal tariff rate whereas it is clearly mentioned in sales circular No. 20/2010 that Registered Gaushala's are liable to pay unit price @ Rs.2/- (copy of the sales circular is attached). Despite his letter dated 23/02/2015 addressed to SDO, Satrod Sub-Division (Photo copy attached) and several verbal/telephonic reminder no action in this regard has been taken. The complainant prayed the Forum that considering the above facts the SDO Satrod Sub-Division may be directed to get his bill rectified as per sales circular No. 20/2010.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 10.10.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The respondent SDO requested through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 3540-41/Court Case/ST dated 07/10/2016 that the complaint was received in his office on 06/10/2016 and reply could not be prepared due to late receipt of complaint and requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for next date.

The hearing was adjourned to the next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply on the next date otherwise cost will be imposed.

To-day, the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016. The representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO is present. The respondent SDO has submitted written reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide letter dated 08/11/2016, stating therein that the tariff charge to the consumer is as per instruction of the Nigam. The fixed charges for the month of 4/2013 to 12/2014 is chargeable to the consumer and the necessary rebate in the tariff to the tune of Rs.2000/- per month has been allowed to the consumer as per Nigam's instructions. The respondent SDO during arguments also stated that the maximum limit of the rebate to be provided to the registered Gaushalas is Rs.2000/- per month per Gaushala. In support of his argument, the respondent SDO also placed on record a copy of Instruction No. 5.21 of Nigam's Manual Sales Instructions (SMI).

-: 2 :-

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum finds that the contention taken by the respondent SDO with regards to the rebate in the tariff to the registered Gaushalas is as per approved tariff schedule of the Nigam, hence no further relief can be allowed to the petitioner as claimed in his petition. The petition is therefore, disposed off without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 8th November, 2016.

(M.M. Gupta)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1485/2016
Date of Institution: 26.09.2016
Date of Hearing: 10.10.2016&08.11.2016
Date of Order: 08.11.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. M.M.Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Asha Kumari W/o Sh. Gauri Shankar, H.No. 597/28, Krishna Nagar, Near Old Power House, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.1, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Representative.
1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.Representative of SDO/Civil Line Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Hisar.

ORDER

Smt. Asha Kumari W/o Sh. Gauri Shanker, H.No. 597/28, Krishna Nagar, Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 6074030000 under SDO/Civil Line Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that her bill is not coming according to consumption. She had earlier submitted a complaint vide complaint No. 1112 A/C No. H12/K101-595 (607403) dated 12/09/2016. After inspection of the pole the Lineman Mr. Pawan Kumar stated that meter wires incoming/outgoing were not connected in proper manners. That is why there is fluctuation in the consumption of units resulting into huge amount bill. She requested the Forum to order the respondent for correction of the fault.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 10.10.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the representative of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The respondent SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. Spl-2 dated 08/10/2016 stating that his office had already checked the above said connection on 14/09/2016 and found meter working in O.K. condition (verification report attached) and the bill generated on reading base as per Nigam instructions. A copy of the reply has been handed over to the representative of consumer.

The hearing was adjourned for next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to produce to the Forum the pattern of consumption of the consumer for last one year.

To-day, the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016. The representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. On the previous date of hearing, the SDO was directed to produce to the Forum the pattern of consumption of the consumer for last one year. The SDO submitted the desired information through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 5825/PF dated 07/11/2016, the bills from 07/2015 to 09/2016 of consumption of consumer. The respondent SDO informed that the Forum that there is no irregularity in the bill of the consumer and the same has been sent as per actual consumption recorded by the energy meter. The consumer's representative on the other hand insisted that the meter reading in the previous period was influenced by some technical error i.e. meter wires incoming/outgoing were not connected in proper manners. The consumption record is as under:-

Billing period	No. of days	Units consumed
7/2015 to 9/2015	53	722
9/2015 to 11/2015	59	460
11/2015 to 01/2016	63	208
01/2016 to 03/2016	54	262
03/2016 to 05/2016	62	814
05/2016 to 07/2016	61	1616
07/2016 to 08/2016	52	877
08/2016 to 09/2016	31	449

The Forum has taken into account the consumption pattern of the consumer as submitted by the respondent SDO for the last one year and observed that there appears to be no abnormality in the consumption as the readings in the summer season were higher and the same were comparatively on lower side in the winter seasons. Hence this Forum does not find any merit in the contention of the consumer that the readings were inflated due to incorrect wiring as there is no definite/consistent pattern of such inflated reading as per bills of last one year placed before the Forum.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decided to close the petition without any relief to the consumer and no cost on other side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 8th November, 2016.

(M.M.Gupta)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1502/2016
Date of Institution: 03.11.2016
Date of Hearing: 08.11.2016
Date of Order: 08.11.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. M.M.Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Gopi Ram S/o Sh. Suraj Bhan, Ward No.6, Main Bazar,
Narnaun, Distt., Hisar regarding restoration of electricity supply.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaund.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Narnaund.

ORDER

Sh. Gopi Ram S/o Sh. Suraj Bhan, Ward No.6, Main Bazar, Narnaund, Distt., Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. NN53-2932 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaund, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that due to wind storm his pole and T/F have broken and fell on the ground in the month of 05/2016. He has made so many complaints up to the level of SE but no action has been taken. He erected the poles at his own cost but the respondent has not connected his connection. He spent Rs.500/- on erection of poles. The respondent Nigam has placed a burnt T/F due to which the supply is not connected and he is unable to irrigate his fields. He requested the Forum to direct the respondent to connect his connection so that he may grow his crops in his field in time.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 08.11.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016. The consumer as well as respondent SDO is present. The respondent SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his Endst.No. 6033 dated 08/11/2016 stating therein that the T/F stand drawn from Store, Hansi on 07/11/2016 and is being replaced to-day positively. Sh. Amarjeet Singh, JE has reported that staff is in the fields of said consumer where replacement of T/F is under process. The respondent SDO has confirmed before this Forum that the supply to the consumer shall be restored after completion of the work which is in progress. The consumer has also been apprised of the action taken by the respondent Nigam during hearing.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum observed that the requisite action on the complaint of the consumer has already been taken by the respondent Nigam, therefore, this Forum decides to dispose off the petition without any cost on either side and the case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 8th November, 2016.

(M.M.Gupta)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1491/2016
Date of Institution: 05.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 21.10.2016&18.11.2016
Date of Order: 18.11.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. M.M.Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Ram Lal S/o Sh. Ladhu Ram, V&P.O. Gudia Khera, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
- 2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Madho Singhana.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.None.

1.Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar.

2.Representative of Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Madho Singhana.

ORDER

Sh. Ram Lal S/o Sh. Ladhu Ram, V&P.O. Gudia Khera, Sirsa, has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. SM02-2640 under SDO/Op.Sub-Division, DHBVN, Madho Singana, Sirsa, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that :-

1. He is living in Dhani which is situated in his field and he is a poor person and is a patient of Cancer. He has a small house in which 2-3 Bulbs and 2 Fans.
2. His above connection is a domestic connection. Every time, his bill comes to Rs.400-500 and paying the bill regularly.
3. In the month of September, 2016, his meter consumed 349 units whose bill is Rs.2789/- which is very high instead of previous readings. He lodged complaint with SDO, Madho Singana of burnt meter and the respondent replaced the same with new meter. When he seen the reading in new meter which was shown 4596.5 units while new meter installed period is 20-25 days. He lodged complaint that his meter is running very fast. The respondent SDO ordered the JE to check his meter. The JE checked the meter and reported that all seals are O.K. and meter is running fast.
4. He requested the SDO to correct his reading and change of meter. The SDO asked him to deposit the bill then after change his meter.

He prayed the Forum to direct the respondent to install a check meter or meter checked from the lab and issued correct bill.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.10.2016 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Sirsa on 21/10/2016, the consumer was not present but the representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.1643 dated 20/10/2016, stating therein that the meter of the consumer replaced vide MCO No. 21/513 dated 08/082016 on IR 0.0 Make Avon whereas as per consumer complaint dated 15/09/2016 site of the consumer checked again and found reading 4596.5 working defective.

As per consumer complaint, the site again checked by Sh. Raj Kumar, JE vide LL-1 No. 40/291 dated 12/10/2016 and found reading 10810, meter removed, packed and referred to lab for verification and the same to be tested/verified on dated 20/10/2016.

-: 2 :-

The hearing was adjourned for next date due to non-presence of consumer with the direction to the respondent to accept current bill payment till the final receipt of report of M&T lab and no disconnection be made till the dispute is decided by this Forum subject to payment of current dues based on new meter consumption.

To-day, the proceedings held at Sirsa on 18/11/2016. The consumer is not present but the representative of respondent SDO is present. The SDO submitted joint checking report vide his memo No. 1803 dated 18/11/2016 in which M&T seal and Firm seal found intact and accuracy of meter checked and found dead stop. After opening the body of the meter, no any abnormality found. Meter referred to Firm for retrieving of the load survey report/data.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to overhaul the account of the consumer on the basis of consumption of the corresponding period or on the basis of new meter consumption whichever is on higher side. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side and case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 18th February, 2015.

(M.M.Gupta)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
website: www.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1487/2016
Date of Institution: 26.09.2016
Date of Hearing:14.10.2016,14.12.2016&
10.01.2017
Date of Order: 10.01.2017.

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Santosh Goswami S/o Late Sh. K.M. Goswami, 10A/19, G.F., Spring Field Colony, Sector-31, Faridabad regarding metering problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Old Division , DHBVN, Old Faridabad.
2.SDO/Op. S/Division (West), DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Representative.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of Sub-Divn. (West), DHBVN,
Faridabad.

ORDER

Sh. Santosh Goswami S/o Late Sh. K..Goswami, 10A/19, G.F., Spring Field Colony, Sector-31, Faridabad has got electricity connection bearing A/C No.0034330000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division(West), DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that:-

1. He was the potential user of the service being tenant rendered by the licensee from September, 2014 to 15 May, 2016 though the electricity connection stand in the name of landlord Varsha Gupta. It is added that he is currently residing at H. No. 285, Ground Floor, I.P.Colony, Sector-30-33, Faridabad, Haryana.
2. The dispute pertains to mthe bill of April, 2016 bearing No. 003436915931 which was INR 10589/- only and the meter reading 16718 and unit consumed was 1416.
3. The units consumed seemed too high and unreliable keeping in view the consumption of electricity in previous one and half years, he registered an online complaint bearing No. 140420161332370034330000 dated 14/04/2016.
4. The units consumed in April, 2015 was below 500 and also given in the peak of summer bill of August, 2015, the units consumed was 1300. Therefore, goin g by the previous all the bills, the present reading of 1416 cannot be a possibility especially when no one was present in home for 16 days in the month of March, 2016.
5. The units consumed in April, 2016 must have been caused due to faulty meter or technical problem or theft and that is why he registered the online complaint but no technician or staff visited his premises or contacted him for a period of 25 days and in utter helplessness he paid the bill online dated 09/05/2016 with fine.
6. The licensee was duty bound to send its technician or staff to his premises for inspection of meter or others but the licensee failed to do that which is a deficiency in service on the part of the licensee within the meaning of C.P. Act, 1986 and for which licensee is bound to compensate him.
7. On dated 28/06/2016, he sent a letter to Assistant General Manager (Operation), F-12, West being the first Redressal grievance authority for the Redressal of grievance but no action was taken upon that.

The consumer prayed the Forum:-

1. That an average of units of previous one year may be taken into account and the same may be charged from him for the month of April, 2016.
2. That the amount of INR 10589/- shall be refunded to his account after deducting the average annual charge and in case this Forum prefer to allow his complaint, it may be directed the licensee to transfer the balance to his account which is; Santosh Goswami, A/C No. 50100139092032, HDFC Bank, Ifsc HDFC0001733.

3. That the relief of inspection of meter or other technical fault is not sought herein as the tenanted premises has been vacated by him on 15/05/2016.
4. That he may be compensated accordingly for the deficiency in service on the part of licensee.
5. Any other relief which this Forum may deem fit and proper.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 14.10.2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Faridabad on 14/10/2016, the consumer as well as respondent SDO was not present.

The hearing was adjourned for next date due to non-presence of both the parties.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the representatives of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply vide his memo No. 1161 dated 17/10/2016, stating therein that the consumer has made complaint regarding meter running fast. After checking the meter and consumption pattern of the previous years, it has been observed that the consumption pattern in the same billing cycle is approximately the same during previous years also and the meter working is O.K. There is no average billing, as such the complaint of the consumer is not genuine, as the correct bill as per consumption is delivered to the consumer. Further the consumption pattern in the same billing cycle in the year 2015, 2012, 2011 & U 2010 is the same.

After hearing both the parties, Forum directed the respondent SDO to be present personally and is submit consumption pattern as discussed at the time of hearing on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10.01.2017. The representative of consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 51 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that the consumer challenged the electricity bill of April, 2016, where the electricity bill of 1418 units was generated and served to the consumer. In the next month of 06/2016, the bill was of 262 KWH and further next bill for the month of August, 2016 was generated for 348 KWH, whereas the same meter was installed and working of meter was O.K. The bill of April, 2016 was also generated on the consumption basis as the meter working was O.K. still the same meter is installed and the working of the meter is O.K. Hence no wrong bill issued and the correct bill has been issued to the consumer and requested to consider the case accordingly.

-: 3 :-

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent and hearing both the parties, the Forum concluded that the bill to the consumer raised on consumption basis, subsequent readings were as per usual consumption pattern of the consumer and the consumer also did not dispute the working of the meter. Thus no relief can be allowed. The Forum therefore decided to dispose off the petition. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1493/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 18.11.2016&15.12.2016
Date of Order: 15.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Guljar Singh S/o Sh. Karnail Singh, Near Verma School, Chattargarh Patti, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
2.SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2. SDO of I/A Sub-Divn.,DHBVN, Sirsa.

ORDER

Sh. Guljar Singh S/o Sh. Karnail Singh, Near Verma School, Chattargarh Patti, Sirsa has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 8724480000 under SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he is paying the bill regularly but suddenly in the month of January, 2016, his meter become defective. The respondent Nigam has replaced the same and installed AVON meter. After installation of AVON meter his bill comes on higher side. He requested the Forum to get replaced his AVON meter and install another company meter and overhaul his account and adjust his excess amount which he has deposited with the respondent Nigam's office.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 18.11.2016 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Sirsa on 18/11/2016, the consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4216/IS dated 11/11/2016 stating therein that consumer having sanctioned load 0.500 KW and meter replaced on 18/01/2016 and again on 22/06/2016 along with consumption detail from 04/2014 to Oct., 2016.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to check the premises and record his load and submit report on or before the next date of hearing. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Sirsa on 15/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted supplementary reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4510/IS-CA dated 15/12/2016, stating therein that as per discussion on 18/11/2016, the premises of the consumer has been checked by Óp. Wing vide LL-1 No. 46/255 dated 18/11/2016 and found used unauthorized extension of load i.e. 4.133 KW against sanctioned load 0.500 KW and reading checked 2513, working pulse blinking. Hence, Rs.1600/- was charged penalty against unauthorized load vide SC&AR No. 97/43/151R and consumer deposited the dues on 25/11/2016. The SDO also stated that the consumer is satisfied.

-: 2 :-

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decided to close the case as per reply submitted by the respondent SDO and amount of Rs.1600/- charged penalty against unauthorized load by the consumer. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 15th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1494/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 18.11.2016&15.12.2016
Date of Order: 15.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Simran W/o Sh. Mohan Lal, Gali No.4, Grewal Basti,
Begu Road, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar.

2.SDO of City Sub-Divn.,DHBVN, Sirsa.

ORDER

Smt. Simran W/o Sh. Mohan Lal, Gali No.4, Grewal Basti, Begu Road, Sirsa, has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 4649280000 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that she is a widow lady and living in her house along with her mother-in-law. She stated that respondent has issued inflated bills. She requested the Forum to get her meter replaced and overhaul her account on the basis of new meter consumption.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 18.11.2016 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Sirsa on 18/11/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 3809 dated 18/11/2016 the respondent SDO submitted month wise consumption details from 02/2015 to 10/2016. The SDO also added that the meter of the consumer has been replaced vide complaint No. 476 date of effect 24/08/2016, final reading recorded 11760, working found block burnt and the same checked by M&T Lab, Sirsa through Challan No. 2 dated 17/10/2016. It seems that reading left/allowed to be accumulated by concerned meter reader.

After hearing both the parties and taking note of the fact that the block of the meter found burnt during M&P Lab checking, the Forum decides to direct the SDO to place on record the report/fact that if there is any impact on the reading of the meter on account of the burnt block of the meter as the consumption recorded during the period of 8/2016 was abnormally higher with reference to the previous consumption and connected load of 0.5 KW of the consumer.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Sirsa on 15/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO again submitted consumption pattern from 02/2015 to 10/2016 as follows:-

Month	Consumption		Difference	Code	Connected load 0.500	Remarks
	New	Old				
02/2015	6916	6798	118	Ok		
04/2015	7074	6916	158	Ok		
06/2016	7424	7074	350	Ok		
10/2015	8067	7424	643	Ok		
12/2015	8211	8067	144	Ok		
02/2016	8328	8211	117	Ok		
04/2016	8466	8328	138	Ok		
06/2016	8853	8466	387	Ok		
07/2016	8883	0	213	AV		
16.06.2016 to 23.06.2016						
08/2016	11760	8853	2907	AV		Adjusted in 09/2016
09/2016	11760	11760	104	AV		Adjusted in 10/2016
10/2016	169	0	169	Ok		

The consumption pattern of the consumer suggests that the consumption in 08/2016 as recorded by meter and shown on average basis was abnormally high. The Forum has also took a note of the fact that the block of the meter found burnt. The SDO was present during the proceedings conceded that the burnt block may affect the working of the meter.

After considering the facts, the Forum decided that the account of the consumer for the period wherein the abnormally higher readings of 2907 units have been taken on average basis, be overhauled, by taking the base of corresponding period or average of last six months or average of consumption for two billing cycles recorded by new meter at the premises of consumer, whichever is higher. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side and case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 15th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1496/2016
Date of Institution: 27.10.2016
Date of Hearing: 15.11.2016
Date of Order: 15.11.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. M.M.Gupta, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Naresh Kumar S/o Sh. Arjun Singh, V&P.O. Guda, Tehsil, Kanina, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding release of new electricity connection.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Mohindergarh.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kanina.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

1.Present.
2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
3.SDO of Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kanina.

ORDER

Sh. Naresh Kumar S/o Sh. Arjun Singh, V&P.O. Guyda, Tehsil, Kanina, Distt., Mohindergarh has applied for release of new electricity connection under SDO/Op Sub-Division, DHBVN, Kanina, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that he had applied for release of new electricity connection but no action has been taken by the Nigam. He visited the respondent office and requested to release new electricity connection. The respondent told him that due to AP feeder, his office cannot be released the connection. The consumer requested the Forum to get release his connection from RDS feeder or any other electricity line.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.11.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

To-day, the proceedings held at Narnaul on 15/11/2016. The consumer as well as respondent SDO is present. The SDO submitted written reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 3950 dated 15/11/2016, stating therein that as per Nigam's Sales Circular No. D-9/2010, domestic connection cannot be released on agriculture feeder. If the consumer wants electricity connection in existing Dhani through Rural Domestic Feeder, he can submit his consent to his office so that estimate is framed and work executed as per Nigam's instructions. The consumer is present during the proceedings and pleaded for release of his DS connection at Nigam cost.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the respondent SDO on the date of hearing and discussion during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decides to close the present case after agreeing to the reply of the respondent SDO that the domestic connection cannot be released from the agriculture feeder as per Nigam policy under Sales Circular No. D-9/2010 after feeder segregation and the HERC and State Govt. providing AP concessional tariff subsidy to the Nigam based on the agriculture consumption recorded on such segregated agriculture feeders. The Forum also directed the respondent SDO to process for the release of connection applied by the consumer expeditiously under the existing policy of the Nigam only. The case is closed from the Forum. The Forum disposes off the petition without any cost on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 15th November, 2016.

(M.M.Gupta)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Telephone No. 01662-223081

(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1480/2016

Date of Institution: 20.09.2016

Date of Hearing: 21.10.2016, 18.11.2016,
15.12.2016 & 20.01.2017

Date of Order: 20.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Technical member-cum-Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Davinder Singh S/o Sh. Ram Kumar, H.No. 181/A, IST, Sirsa regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. City Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.
- 2.SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.None.

1.Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN,Hisar.

2.SDO of I/A Sub-Divn.,DHBVN, Sirsa.

ORDER

Sh. Davinder Singh S/o Sh. Ram Kumar, H.No. 181/A, IST, Sirsa, has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 7054870000 (Old A/C No. HB41-0056) under SDO/Op. Indl. Area Sub-Division, DHBVN, Sirsa, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that the respondent had issued bill of 4080 KWH while KVAH reading is 14801.34 which is not feasible. The complainant requested the Forum to issue him the corrected bill in KWH and KVAH.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 21.10.2016 at Sirsa for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Sirsa on 21/10/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4029/IS-CA dated 17/10/2016 stating therein that consumer having an LT connection relates with ICE candy which is a seasonal industry LT connection and billing issued on KVAH basis as per Nigam instruction. During the period 05/06/2016 to 05/07/2016 reading recorded by meter reader as 3451.11 to 5918 KVAH & 3106 to 3786 KWH and difference made as per MF 6 is 14801.34 KVAH and 4080 KWH which is abnormal being after that period difference of KVAH and KWH is normal.

During this period the consumer deposited an amount of Rs.65000/- lump-sum basis/part payment on dated 01/08/2016.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to arrange M&P wing for checking of meter within a period of 15 days and submit test results along with his comments on the next date of hearing.

The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Sirsa on 18/11/2016, the consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 4238/IS-CA dated 16/11/2016, stating therein that his office requested to XEN/M&P Division, Hisar vide his office memo No. 4121S-36 dated 28/10/2016 and again remind vide E-mail dated 11/11/2016 as per advice/Discussion on dated 21/10/2016 with Nodal Officer/CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar.

The M&T Team checked the site vide MT-1 page No.36 Book No. 405 dated 15/11/2016 and found reading in Kwh 4115.8 & KVAH 6341 and check the seal of MCB and found in order accuracy of meter checked with LT equa Check (by applied temporary load) and found within permissible limit (report enclosed).

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directed the respondent SDO to get the meter checked from manufacturer with specific reference to KVA reading working and place the findings before the Forum on next date. The connection may not be disconnected till the final decision of this Forum. The disputed amount be restrained. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings were held at Sirsa on 15/12/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO 'Op.' informed the Forum that the consumer has been asked to accompany the staff of sub-division to the manufacturer or depute his representative but the consumer has either opted to go nor appointed any representative. The consumer agreed to the submission of SDO. The Forum after hearing both the parties directed the respondent SDO to give final notice to the consumer for associating in testing of meter from the manufacturer. The case was adjourned for next date.

The proceedings were held at Sirsa on 20/01/2017. The consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 204/IS-CA dated 20/01/2017, stating therein that the consumer is not ready to go the firm's Lab for testing/verification of meter and agreed to pay his bill amount in full. The consumer has paid the full amount on 19/12/2016.

The Forum has considered all the facts of the case and also noted that the consumer has already paid full amount in dispute on 19/12/2016. The consumer has also not appeared before the Forum to present his case nor accompanied the Nigam officials to the firm's lab for testing of the meter as per earlier direction of the Forum. Since, the amount has already been deposited by the consumer; the Forum decides to dispose off the petition. No cost on either side. The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under hands on this day of 20th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member-
cum- Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member/Accounts



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
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1486/2016
Date of Institution: 26.09.2016
Date of Hearing: 10.10.2016, 08.11.2016
& 09.12.2016
Date of Order: 09.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member
Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Haridev S/o Sh. Ranjeet Singh, V&P.O. Satrod, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.II, DHBVN, Hisar.
2.SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF,
DHBVN, Hisar.

2.SDO/Op. Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Satrod,
Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. Haridev S/o Sh. Ranjeet Singh, V&P.O. Satrod, Tehsil & Distt., Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 3745280000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division, DHBVN, Satrod, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that his meter is showing excess reading due to which his bill is raised on higher side. He has neither water motor nor Atta Chaki. He has only fan and cooler in his premises. And only two old persons are residing in it. His bill was always raised by the respondent for Rs.2000-3000/-. Now the respondent issued bill Rs.81000/-, Rs.114403/- and Rs.40000/-. He deposited Rs.22000 and Rs.50000/-. He requested the Forum to get his bill corrected.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 10.10.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The respondent SDO requested through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 3538-39/Court Case/ST dated 07/10/2016 that the complaint was received in his office on 06/10/2016 and reply could not be prepared due to late receipt of complaint and requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for next date.

The hearing was adjourned to the next date with the direction to the respondent SDO to submit proper reply on the next date otherwise cost will be imposed.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. SPL-4/ST/HSR dated 08/11/2016, stating therein that:-

1. The applicant is false, frivolous and vexatious and has been filed only to harass and humiliate the answering respondents and as such is liable to be dismissed.
2. The present application is wholly misconceived, groundless and unsustainable in law and is liable to be dismissed on this ground alone.
3. The applicant is stopped to file the present application by her act and conduct.
4. The applicant has got no cause of action to file the present application against the answering respondents.
5. The applicant has not come to this Forum with clean hands and has suppressed the true and material facts from this Forum. Therefore, he is not entitled to any relief.
6. The applicant has no locus standi to file the present application against the answering respondents.
7. The present application is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.
8. The application has not been signed, instituted and verified according to law.

-: 2 :-

The respondent prayed that:-

1. The consumer having A/C No. 3745280000 (Old A/C No. SS1D-3469) under D/S Category.
2. The meter of the consumer got checked vide report No. 29 dated 28/05/2016 and found the meter within permissible limit (copy of report attached).
3. The consumer was asked to appear in M&T lab on 03/11/2016 but he did not appear. The meter of the consumer again got checked into M&T lab, DHBVN, Hisar on dated 03/11/2016 vide report No. 70 dated 03/11/2016 and found the meter within permissible limit (copy of report attached).

Keeping in view the above facts and submission, it is, therefore, prayed that the application of the applicant may be dismissed without cost.

The consumer on the other side has insisted that the bills were raised on the higher side, the readings were not taken by the meter reader regularly and bills were not raised according to the actual consumption. The consumer also stated that he is a senior citizen of about 80 years and living in the house with his spouse and they have already paid an amount of Rs.72000/- with DHBVN by encashing his fixed deposits in the banks which he saved out of his pensions for the old age.

The Forum hears both the parties and also taken into account, the consumption data of the consumer for the last three years placed on records by the respondent SDO. The consumption data shows inconsistency from Jan., 2015 onwards as in certain billing periods, the consumption has been shown 0-6 units and on the other hand it is as high as more than 9000 units in some other billing period.

After consideration of the case, the Forum directs the SDO to appear before the Forum along with a detailed explanation of the consumption and charges recoverable/already deposited by the consumer from Jan., 2015 onwards till date. The case was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The respondent SDO appeared before the Forum in person and argued that the meter of the consumer has been got checked from the lab twice and found within permissible limit. Regarding the variation in the readings it was stated that the higher readings are for longer durations and preparation of wrong bills due to implementation of RAPDRP. The SDO has justified the case on the ground that a refund of Rs. 48306/- and Rs. 39888/- has been allowed to the consumer in the month of July and Sept, 2016 on account of erroneous readings shown by the meter i.e. 5669 in May, 2016 and 5618 in July, 2016. It was also stated that the connected load at site is much more than sanctioned load and on site verification a number of tenants were residing in the premises hence the consumption is justified and as per recorded by the meter duly verified by the lab.

-: 3 :-

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decided to close the case as the meter of the consumer already checked in the lab twice and found within limit, load data of the consumer and refund of Rs. 88194/- in the consumer account on account of erroneous units of 11287 kwh shown consumed in the month of May and July, 2016. The consumer also agreed to pay the outstanding bill within 3 installments which was allowed. It was however, noted by the Forum that there are deficiency at the part of the meter reading as no regular and proper meter readings have been found recorded leading to the harassment of the consumer. The SDO is directed to take appropriate action against the erring meter reader. The case is closed from the Forum. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 9th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1477/2016
Date of Institution: 16.09.2016
Date of Hearing: 18.10.2016,15.11.2016&
21.12.2016
Date of Order: 21.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Jaidayal Singh, V&P.O.Mandhi,
Tehsil, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh regarding safety.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Operation Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.
- 2.SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaul.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:
For the Respondent:

- 1.Present.
- 2.Representative of Nodal Officer /CGRF,
DHBVN,Hisar
- 3.Representative of S/U Sub-Division,
Narnaul.

ORDER

Sh. Partap Singh S/o Sh. Jaidayal Singh, V&P.O. Mandhi, Tehsil, Narnaul, Distt., Mohindergarh has got an electricity connection No.1429 under SDO/Op. S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaul, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating therein that an AP connection line was idle due to damage of tube well. He wrote the respondent so many times but respondent has not taken any action in this regard. The complainant requested the Forum to get removed this idle line of old AP connection, so that he and his family lives can be saved.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 18.10.2016 at Narnaul for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Narnaul on 18/10/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The representative of respondent SDO assured that the process of preparation of estimates for shifting the LT line is under process and sought time of one month for redressing the grievance of the consumer.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum considered the position and after due consideration allowed time of one month to the respondent SDO to shift the line.

The hearing was adjourned for next date and compliance shall be obtained and report to the Forum for further hearing.

During the proceedings held at Narnaul on 15/11/2016, the consumer was not present but the representative of respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted written reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 2880 dated 15/11/2016, stating therein that the estimate for changing the route of LT line passing over the residential house/plot of Sh. Partap Singh R/o Village Mandi from 100 KVA T/F Bus Stand Wala to existing 25 KVA through LT AB Cable under his office has been sanctioned vide estimate No. 210/SPL/SU/16-17 (copy attached). The work will be carried out within one month after availability of material.

After hearing the representative of respondent SDO and consumer not being present on the date of proceeding, the case was adjourned for next date with the direction to the representative of respondent SDO and consumer to file the status report before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Narnaul on 21/12/2016. The consumer and representative of respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted supplementary reply through representative of Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No.2295 dated 21/12/2016, stating that his office has sent a memorandum to XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Narnaul for shifting of LT line passing over the house of Sh. Partap Singh and others village Mandi, Tehsil Narnaul of 100 KVA T/F SOP to LD System village Mandi out of Lal Dora. Line is existing for a long time and is adjoining to the residential area of Mandi. Presently, there is no route available with the existing system. It is proposed to dismantle the line after connecting from 25 KVA SOP to LD System by erecting 230 Mtr. LT AB cable as composite line on HT poles existing in new route. There is danger to the public/residents whose houses are existing below the line. Sh. Partap Singh has also made the complaint in CGRF of Nigam. To avoid any accident in future, line is urgently required to be shifted.

-: 2 :-

Total expenditure for execution of work will be Rs.20778/-. Hence necessary approval may kindly be accorded in view of Sales Instruction No. 2/2016. The SDO stated that as and when the permission granted, the work will be done accordingly.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing, status of the work submitted by the SDO and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum disposes off the petition with the direction to the respondent SDO to complete the work of shifting of the line within a period of two months time. No costs to either side and case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 21st December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1472/2016

Date of Institution: 31.08.2016

**Date of Hearing: 06.09.2016,10.10.2016,
08.11.2016&09.12.2016**

Date of Order: 09.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Suresh Chand, 413, Auto Market, Hisar regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. XEN/Op. Division No.1, DHBVN, Hisar.

2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.None.

1.Representative of Nodal Officer, CGRF,
DHBVN, Hisar.

2.SDO/Op. City Sub-Divn., DHBVN, Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. Suresh Chand, 413, Auto Market, Hisar has got an electricity connection bearing A/C No. 0941920000 under SDO/Op. City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Hisar, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that his meter has been jumping once in one or two months and showing excess consumption. He has already deposited 2-3 bills of Rs.15000/-. He had given 3-4 application for change of meter but no action has been taken by the respondent. He requested the Forum to get his meter changed and send the same to the laboratory for testing and he is ready to deposit the fee for change of meter.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 06.09.2016 at Hisar for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 06/09/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The representative of SDO stated that due to late receipt of the petition, the reply could not be prepared and requested the Forum to grant next date for submission of the same. He further stated that account of the consumer has been overhauled and a sum of Rs.26624/- is refundable to the consumer. This amount will be reflected in the electricity bill to be issued in the month of September, 2016.

The consumer stated that for the period of 05/04/2016 to 05/08/2016 the bill for Rs.39465/- has been issued which is excessive keeping in view the sanctioned load and pattern of previous consumption.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum directs the respondent SDO to accept the energy charges and other taxes for 212 units recorded for the period 06/07/2016 to 05/08/2016. In the subsequent bill to be issued in September, 2016, the amount refundable to the consumer be refunded. Besides he was directed to submit proper reply of complaint on the next date.

The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 10/10/2016, the representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. On the previous date of hearing, the SDO was directed that in the bill to be issued in September, 2016, the amount refundable to the consumer be refunded and also to submit proper reply of the complaint.

The respondent SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 6638 dated 10/10/2016 that the consumer lodged a complaint regarding erratic behavior of the meter on 04/04/2016. Accordingly, the meter of the consumer was changed on 03/06/2016 vide MCO No. 8941720906. Also the meter was sent to M&T lab for further verification and as per M&T lab report, meter was found dead stop. It is further submitted that after change of meter consumer was issued bill of Rs.38893/- on 16/08/2016 which was corrected through SC&AR No. 155/52-C and a sum of Rs.26624/- has been adjusted in consumer account. The adjusted amount of Rs.26624/- is reflected in the bill issued during September, 2016. A copy of the reply has been handed over to the representative of the consumer who stated that he will submit replication on the next date of hearing.

The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 08/11/2016, the consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The consumer submitted replication stating therein that he is not satisfied with the bill amount. He has added the amount of each cycle individually. The sum paid is Rs.88807/- but it is excessive. He requested the Forum to accept his application and help him have justice. He also stated that his usual consumption is not more than 100 units per month and requested to find a solution of his problem.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum decided that a copy of the replication submitted by the consumer may be given to the respondent SDO. The case was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Hisar on 09/12/2016. The consumer was not present but the respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted consumption data of 4 years. The representative of the SDO also stated that meter of the consumer has already been changed on 03/06/2016 vide MCO No. 8941720906. The meter was sent to M&T lab for further verification and as per M&T lab report, meter was found dead stop. It is further submitted that after change of meter consumer was issued bill of Rs.38893/- on 16/08/2016 which was corrected through SC&AR No. 155/52-C and a sum of Rs.26624/- has been adjusted in consumer account. The adjusted amount of Rs.26624/- is to be reflected in the bill issued during September, 2016. Further as per consumption data submitted by the SDO the PL adjustment for Rs. 20581/- for the period May, 16 to July, 16 also made to consumer account.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent on the date of hearing and discussion held during the course of hearing in the case, the Forum decided to close the case as the meter of the consumer already replaced, checked from lab and requisite adjustments in the consumer accounts also made by the respondent SDO. The Nodal Officer will ensure the credits in the consumer accounts as per reply of the SDO above and inform the Forum. No costs on either side.

File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 9th December, 2016.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

RYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM

Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005

Tel. No. 01662-223081

v.dhbvn.com

(e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1419/2016

Date of Institution: 04.07.2016

Date of Hearing: 12.07.2016,12.08.2016,

14.09.2016,14.10.2016&

14.12.2016&10.01.2017

Date of Order: 10.01.2017

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Chairman

Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member

Sh. Satish Malik, Member

In the matter of complaint Sh. Dawarka Parsad, Flat No.14, Shivshakti Apptt., GH-15, Sector-21-C, Part-III, Faridabad regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen/Op. Division , DHBVN, Old Faridabad.

2.SDO/Op. S/Division No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

For the Respondent:

1.Present.

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar

2.SDO of Sub-Divn. No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad.

ORDER

Sh. Dawarka Prasad, Flat No.14, Shivshakti Apptt., GH-15, Sector-21-C, Part-III, Faridabad has got electricity connection bearing A/C No. 9105540000 under SDO/Op. Sub-Division No.4, DHBVN, Faridabad, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint, stating therein that he got electricity bill of March, 2015 with new reading as 36435 and old reading 31063, net reading 5372 and amount Rs.40732/-. On his verbal request, the bill was corrected to new reading as 31623 and an amount of Rs.3310/- was paid by the consumer. Again he got bill with new reading as 31448 and old reading 36435 with net reading as 2067 units and amount of bill Rs.54229/-. The bill was again corrected on his verbal request by correcting old unit to 31623 and an amount of Rs.1826/- was paid by the consumer on 03/07/2015. He received next bill on dated 30/07/2015 with new reading as nil and old reading also nil and bill amount was Rs.69649/-. The bill was again corrected to old reading as 31948 and new reading as 33019 and the consumer paid Rs.10479/-. The respondent issued bill on nil reading basis again and again which is wrong. The complainant requested the Forum to order for refund of excess amount charged by DHBVN which is Rs.10479/- plus late payment charges paid Rs. 717/- plus interest @ 36% P.A. and Rs.5.00 lacs towards deficient services provided to him.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 12.07.2016 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Faridabad on 12/07/2016, the consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The Nodal Officer/CGRF, intimated the Forum that the respondent SDO has requested her on telephone that due to late receipt of the petition, the reply could not be prepared and has requested for next date for submission of reply. Request granted.

During the proceedings held at Faridabad on 12/08/2016, neither the consumer nor the SDO was present. The Forum had directed the respondent SDO on the previous date of hearing to furnish reply on the next date otherwise cost will be imposed on him. Since the consumer himself is not present, cost cannot be imposed upon the SDO. However, non-submission of reply on two successive dates has been viewed very seriously by the Forum in view of the fact that normally the Forum has to decide the complaint within a period of 3 months. The Nodal Officer/CGRF is, therefore, directed to take up the matter with SE/Op. Circle, Faridabad to take action against the SDO for his failure to submit reply to the petition on two successive dates.

The hearing was adjourned for next date with the direction to both the parties to remain personally present on the next date and with further direction to the respondent to furnish reply.

During the proceedings held at Faridabad on 14/09/2016, the consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 957 dated 17/08/2016, stating that the bill of the consumer raised in the month of March, 2015 was rectified on the basis of reading and working of meter verified by JE. After that all the data was migrated by M/s Hartron to M/s HCL under RARDRP scheme. Due to change of software and billing agency, all the activities of verification of reading could not be updated by M/s Hartron, even though all the advices were sent to M/s Hartron. Due to new software, all the staff was not well conversant with the system and bills were raised on average basis. The bill was rectified in the month of 12/2015 by crediting Rs.107885/- in the bill and correct bill generated through system was delivered to the consumer. Onward 12/2015, all the bills issued to the consumer are correct and on the basis of reading/consumption. The erroneous bills generated during 6,8 &10/2015 were only due to non-updating of data by M/s Hartron and the staff of sub-division were in learning stage with new RAPDRP system software. A copy of the reply has been handed over to the consumer. The consumer stated that he will submit rejoinder on the next date of hearing.

The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Faridabad on 14/10/2016, the consumer as well as respondent SDO was not present. The hearing was adjourned for next date due to non-presence of both the parties.

During the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 14/12/2016, the consumer and respondent SDO were present. The consumer requested for providing complete details as per his representation from 03/2015 to 28/01/2016. The Forum directed the respondent SDO to give full details of the case to the consumer which he desires. The SDO was also directed to resolve the issue and redress the grievance of the consumer on or before the next date of hearing.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Faridabad on 10.01.2017. The consumer and respondent SDO were present. The SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 24 dated 10/01/2017, stating therein that the complaint has been resolved and adjustment made an amount of Rs.10162/- to the consumer's account vide SC&AR No. 92/R-205 on account of surcharge of average charged imposed during the billing cycle from 03/2015 to 12/2015 due to changing of new Software R-APDRP averages of above period adjusted by the system and surcharge of averages adjusted manually. Copy of SC&AR enclosed for ready reference. A copy of reply has been handed over to the consumer. The consumer present on the other side insisted to know as to how the error in his bills occurred and who is responsible for the same. The consumer also insisted for cash payment of the amount which he paid in excess to DHBVN.

After going through the case file, the information/documents supplied by the applicant as well as by the respondent and after hearing both the parties, the Forum decided to close the case as the grievance of the consumer has been redressed by the respondent SDO by affording credit of Rs. 10162/- in his bill. The application is disposed off with no costs on either side. File be consigned to record.

Given under our hands on this day of 10th January, 2017.

(Atul Pasrija)
Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member

(Satish Malik)
Member



REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
RYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Phone: 01662-223081
v.dhbvn.com (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1418/2016
Date of Institution: 30.06.2016
Date of Hearing: 29.07.2016, 29.08.2016,
29.09.2016, 20.10.2016 &
29.11.2016
Date of Order: 29.12.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Technical Member-cum-Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts
Sh. Satish Malik, Independent Member

In the matter of complaint of Sh. S.P.Saxena S/o Sh. M.M.L. Saxena (M/s Unitech Ltd., Unitech House, Block-L, South City-1, Gurgaon) A1-23, Sushant Lok-II, Sector-55, Gurgaon regarding billing problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S /U Division , DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/CCC South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:	1.Dr. Santokh Singh & R K Pandey, Advocates
For the Respondent:	1. Rahil Kohli, Advocate of DSK Legal, 2. SE/SO, DHBVN, Hisar. 3. Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar 4. Sr. AO/OA, DHBVN, Hisar 5. SDO, South City, DHBVN, Gurgaon. 6. AEE/SO, DHBVN, Hisar.

ORDER

Sh. S.P.Saxena S/o Sh. M.M.L. Saxena (M/s Unitech Ltd., Unitech House, Block-L, South City-1, Gurgaon) A1-23, Sushant Lok-II, Sector-55, Gurgaon has got electricity connections bearing A/C Nos. IND6-0008, IND6-0012, IND6-0009, IND63-0021 (Old), IND6-

0081 (New) & IND6-0010&0069 under SDO/CCC South City Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint stating therein that:-

1. The complainant is consumer of the Respondent with following particulars:

<u>Name of Consumer</u>	<u>Account Number</u>
Unitech Cyber Park D&E	IND6-0008
Unitech Business Park	IND6-0012
Unitech Cyber Park A&B	IND6-0009
Unitech Group Leader Signature Tower	IND63-0021 (Old) IND6-0081 (New)
Unitech Cyber Tower C	IND6-0010&0069

2. The complainant is duly permitted by M/s Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Ltd. by issuing 'no-objection' to seek and avail Open Access through POWER EXCHANGE in accordance with applicable regulations of CERC/HERC. Further, it was obligatory on the part of the complainant to avail the day ahead transaction to submit the schedule of power through open access by 10:00 A.M. of the day preceding the day of transaction.
3. The complainant humbly submits that so far it has meticulously observed and followed the schedule prescribed as per regulations of CERC/HERC and has intimated the respondent through emails well before time about the said schedule for availing Open Access for each day as is clear from APPENDIX 'A' to this complaint.
4. The complainant further submits that none of the e-mails sent by it to the respondent and others bounced back or failed due to delivery failure notice through any of the email service providers. The non-availability of the bid with the respondent for any reason whatsoever cannot be attributed to the complainant as it has not defaulted any time in submitting the schedule in time.
5. The respondent vide ANNEXURE C-1 dated 28/07/2015 wrongly intimated the complainant about excess refund by the respondent on account of Open Access energy amounting to Rs.1,27,96,276/- regarding the five accounts mentioned hereinabove in para 1.
6. The complainant many a times visited the respondent office and explained that the claim/notice of excess refund is not justified as the day ahead scheduling was meticulously followed on all the dates of transaction but all visits by the complainant went in vain. The complainant through ANNEXURE -2 dated 04/11/2015 (received in the respondent office on 19/11/2015) explained account-wise that it has been excessively charged and the excess amount thus charged should be refunded.
7. The complainant on 18/02/2016 requested the respondent through ANNEXURE C-3 to refund the excess amount by way of refund considering no default committed by the complainant.
8. The respondent, of course, partly vide ANNEXURE C-4 dated 23/05/2016 allowed reimbursement of Rs.4583921/- in favour of the complainant but again illegally and wrongly insisted the complainant for charging of Rs.8212355/- for no fault of the complainant.
9. The respondent did not allow the refund in case of all account either that that day bid not available so the schedule of that period became invalid, or sub-division between two accounts not allowed or actual drawl not provided.
10. The stand taken by the respondent to deny the complainant on the ground that either the bid was not available so the schedule of that period became invalid, or sub-division between two accounts not allowed or actual drawl not provided is neither factual nor justified in any manner whatsoever. ANNEXURE C-5 (colly) to C-9 (colly) contain set of documents providing that the complainant met its obligation to avail the Open Access system for its power utility and this is also supported by a daily obligation summary report of the Indian Energy Exchange. APPENDIX 'A' to this complaint makes it abundantly clear that denial of refund by the respondent was not justified in any manner.
11. It is submitted that the respondent has illegally and for no justifiable reasons denied the complainant of its refund of Rs.3983592/- (Thirty Nine Lac Eighty Three Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Two Only) on the due date and deprived the complainant of its monetary benefits.

In view of the above, it is prayed that Forum may award the following reliefs in favour of the complainant and against the respondent:

- a) Direct the respondent to refund the amount of Rs.3983592/- along with interest at the rate of 18% per annum to the complainant.
- b) Direct the respondent to pay the administrative cost of Rs.1,00,000/- to the complainant.

- c) Direct the respondent to pay the legal cost of Rs.1,00,000/- to the complainant.
- d) Any other relief which Forum deems fit in the facts and circumstances of this case.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 29/07/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 29/07/2016, the representative of consumer as well as concerned SDO was present. The SDO submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 29/07/2016 stating that all Open Access case are dealt by Sr.A.O./Open Access, DHBVN, Hisar and requested the Forum to implead Sr.A.O./Open Access, DHBVN, Hisar as a necessary party.

The Forum considered the request of the SDO and found that there is no need for impleadment of Sr.A.O./Open Access, DHBVN, Hisar separately as the respondent in this case is CE/Commercial and the Sr.A.O./Open Access is an officer working under CE/Commercial.

The Forum directs the Nodal Officer/CGRF that the copy of petition be sent to the respondent named in the petition and ensure submission of reply and presence of the concerned dealing officer on the next date of hearing. In case of non-submission of reply on the next date, cost will be imposed.

The case was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 29/08/2016, the representatives of consumer and the respondent were present. On the last date of hearing, the respondent was required to furnish reply on the next date of hearing, otherwise cost will be imposed.

The representative of the respondent Sh. Arun Kumar, Sr.A.O./Open Access intimated the Forum that the change of the date of hearing was intimated only a few days earlier and the reply is ready but the same could not be got signed from the Chief Engineer/Commercial because of his pre-engagements in important meetings. He requested the Forum that the reply will be submitted by the evening and further requested that cost may not be imposed in view of failure to furnish reply due to unavoidable circumstances.

The counsel of the petitioner Dr. Santokh Singh objected to the request of the respondent and stated that the respondent was having sufficient time to prepare the reply but the same is still not ready which will delay the process of the Forum and the purpose of the electricity Act, 2003.

The representative of the respondent stated that the DHBVN being Govt. Company there are internal processes for the movement of the file and they have not left any stone unturned in preparing the proper reply which is ready and is lying on the table of the Chief Engineer/Commercial. He requested the Forum again that time be allowed up to the evening for submission of reply to the Forum without imposition of cost. Request granted.

The hearing was adjourned for next date with the direction to the respondent to submit the reply to the Forum immediately with a copy to the petitioner.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 29/09/2016, on behalf of the consumer Dr. Santokh Singh, counsel of consumer, Sh. S.P.Saxena & Sh. Sudhir Kumar and on behalf of respondent Sh. Pardeep Dhull, SDO, Sh. Arun Kumar Verma, Sr.A.O./Open Access are present.

On the last date of hearing the respondent was directed to furnish reply to the petition immediately with a copy to the petitioner. The reply submitted by Chief Engineer/Commercial, DHBVN, Hisar through Nodal Officer/CGRF vide his memo No. 380/Sr.AO/Open Access dated 16/09/2016. A copy of the same was stated to be sent to Sh. S.P.Saxena (of M/s Unitech) but the counsel for the consumer stated that no reply has been received so far. The respondent was directed to provide a copy of reply to the applicant and the same has been provided to him. The counsel for the consumer stated that he will submit his replication on the next date of hearing.

The Chief Engineer/Commercial, DHBVN on behalf of respondent has submits that:-

Para No. 1: Matter of records.

Para No. 2: Complainant was allowed open access facility by HVPN on the basis of consent given by his office and it was obligatory on the part of complainant to submit the schedule of power through open access by 10 AM of the day preceding the day of transaction to the distribution licensee (As per regulation no. 42 eligibility criteria placed

at annexure-I). It is evident that in the event of non-conforming to the obligation as per HERC regulation or non submission of day ahead schedule will lead to non consideration of schedule.

Para no. 3: The consumer representations and emails submitted by the complainant were sent to the office of SE/SO for verification of submission of morning bids, but the same was denied by the office of SE/SO with the remarks that "morning bids for above mentioned dates have been checked from the available record in his office and found that above mentioned morning bids were not incorporated in the consolidated schedule sent to HPPC and others, either the bids were not received or received before/after the schedule time in this regard" i.e. before 00 hrs and after 10 A.M. of the day ahead. Copy of noting page where in the bids were verified by AE/SO is attached as annexure-II.

Para no. 4: Part of the para is denied for want of knowledge. Rest of the para is as stated in para no. 2 above.

Para no.5,6,7,8,9 and 10: All five accounts of M/s Unitech Ltd. Were initially overhauled on dated 28/07/2015 for the period 12/2013 to 12/2014 and found chargeable amount of Rs.12796196/- and the same was informed to the SDO (OP) concerned for further necessary action. The process adopted in overhauling was as under:-

The difference between refundable as per open access regulation on the basis of data supplied by SE/SO, DHBVN/HVPN and the amount actually refunded by sub-division office was calculated and intimated to sub-division for charging the amount refund in excess after due verification of all the details at their end.

The consumer represented and raised some observations against the charging notice. On the basis of the representation. SDO (OP) South City 1 revised the data and the office, of SE/SO also revised the data of Unitech Tower C. On the basis of revised data from SDO, South City and SE/SO the consumer accounts were re-overhauled and the chargeable amount was revised to Rs.8212355/-. The same was also intimated on dated 23/05/2016 to the SDO/South City for further necessary action. The detail of overhauling the all five accounts is as under:-

Detail charging of M/s Unitech Ltd. For the period 12/2013 to 12/2014:

1st Memo No. 66/1204/Sr.AO dated 28/07/2015					
Sr. No.	Name of Consumer	A/C No.	Adjusted Amt. S/Divn.	Adjustable Amt. as per OA	Diff. chargeable
1.	Unitech Cyber part D&E	IND6-0008	55280383	50937011	4343372
2.	Unitech Business Park	IND6-0012	2523219	2114419	408800
3.	Unitech Cyber park A&B	IND6-0009	26999728	25414328	1585400
4.	Unitech Group Leader	IND6-0021	9826058	7820470	2005588
5.	Unitech Cyber part C	IND6-10&69	20925956	16472920	4453036
		Total	115555344	102759148	12796196
3rd Memo No. 162/1204/Sr.AO/Open Access dated 23/05/2016					
1.	Unitech Cyber park D&E	IND6-0008	52890736	51185591	1705145
2.	Unitech Business Park	IND6-0012	3596516	2114338	1482178
3.	Unitech Cyber park A&B	IND6-0009	27586712	25975656	1611056
4.	Unitech Group Leader	IND6-0021	9826109	7815154	2010955
5.	Unitech Cyber park C	IND6-10&69	42269144	40866122	1403021
		Total	136169217	127956862	8212355

Rs. 8212355/- were intimated finally to the SDO South City for charging after due verification of all the details at their end (Copy attached as annexure-III). The charging of amount was on account of excess refunds given by the SDO(OP) South City which also

includes the amount on account of non submission of day ahead schedule/morning bids by the complainant. The amount was charged as per HERC regulation dated 03/12/2013.

Para no. 11: As per HERC regulation 8 (3) of HERC term and conditions for grant of connectivity and open access transmission and distribution system regulation 2012 vide regulation No. HERC/25/2012 1st amendment/Dec-2013, "A group of two or more consumers of a distribution licensee having a combined contract demand of 0.5 MVA or above and connected to the distribution system of licensee at 11 KV or above through an independent feeder emanating from a grid sub-station, shall also be entitled for seeking open access if all such consumers collectively apply for open access through a group representative to be nominated by all such consumers on that feeder provided that all such consumers shall have necessary infrastructure for time-block wise energy metering and accounting installed at their premises and provided further that schedule of power through open access of individual consumers shall also be supplied by the group representative". From this regulation it is very much evident that morning bids of individual consumers shall also be supplied by the group representative" but the complainant submitted combined morning bids in the name of Unitech signature tower and he failed to mention that this bid includes other group consumer also and he failed to submit morning bids separately for other consumers. It is pertinent to mention here that complainant from July, 2014 onwards was submitting morning bids separately for each consumer. So the claim of complainant that he has submitted morning bids for other group consumers does not hold good and hence denied. The morning bids submitted by the consumer were considered for M/s Unitech Signature Tower only and bid of Unitech Business Part not found received for the month of May, 2014 and June, 2014.

Para No.12: Para No, 12 is wrong and denied. It is stated that out of Rs.8212355/- complainant admitted that Rs.4228763/- are rightly chargeable for which Nigam has not claimed any interest till now, also Rs.3983592/- retained on account of non confirmation of morning bids on the part of complainant are also rightly chargeable as per HERC regulation Dec-2013 because in the event of non submission of morning bids to the office of SE/SO the admissibility of open access energy as per open access regulation elibility criteria becomes nil.

Also the bids which are not considered by the office of SE/SO, DHBVN, Hisar has also been checked on the other email id oaharyana@gmail.com mentioned in the consumer representation and the same was also not found received on that email id also. Copy of inbox of email id oaharyana@gmail.com is also attached as annexure-IV. The amount on this account was rightly charged and is as per HERC regulation December, 2013.

Also the relevant portion of HERC open access regulation clause 2.4 in statement of objects and reasons at page no.7 is reproduced as under:

"The foremost among these additional conditions is that for day ahead transactions, the open access consumers shall submit a confirmed slot-wise schedule of power through open access and from the licensee for the next day at 10:00 hours of the previous day to the distribution licensee and SLDC. In case there are any reductions in his open access schedule when it is finally accepted/cleared by the power exchange, he would be required to manage his drawl from the licensee as also his total drawl accordingly. In case he exceeds his admissible drawl in any time-slot, penalty will be leviable. Amendments have been made in the relevant regulations accordingly. The principle that has been based upon to arrive at these conclusions is simple i.e. in case a consumer wants to avail the benefit of cheaper power, he should be ready to face the associated risks also if any".

So, the principle is simple if a consumer wants to avail the benefit of cheaper power, he should be ready to face the associated risks also. So the amount of Rs.8212355/- is rightly charged to the complainant and is as per HERC regulation Dec-2013 on the matter.

It is, therefore, prayed that the complaint is not justified in the eyes of law and needs to be decided in favour of Nigam.

After perusal of the reply with reference to the petition filed by the consumer, the Forum finds that the following issues are to be decided:-

1. Is it statutory requirement that the consumer shall submit to the distribution licensee a schedule of power required through Open Access and licensee by 10.00 A.M. of the day preceding the day of transaction?

2. Has the consumer done the same? If a schedule was not adhered by the consumer what loss has been caused to the licensee or what gain has been made by the consumer.
3. In case of non-submission/late submission of morning bids what remedy is available to the licensee?
4. The relevant instructions for such remedy.
5. Has the licensee followed the relevant instructions before charging the amount or before debiting the same?

The counsel for the consumer produced to the Forum State Public Information Officer-cum-Assistant Engineer/RTI, HVPNL, Panchkula memo No. Ch-5/RTI-3823 dated 28/09/2016 (which consists of 14 pages) in support of his claim that relevant instructions regarding intimating the licensee before 10.00 A.M. of the day preceding day of requirement of Open Access has been conveyed.

The hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Hisar on 20/10/2016, the counsel of consumer as well as representatives of the respondent was present. The counsel of the consumer has also submitted rejoinder on the reply submitted by the Nigam, stating that:-

1. The reply submitted by respondent is inadmissible, as it is not supported with the affidavit.
2. Section 42 (1) of the electricity Act, 2003 mandates that it is the duty of the respondent to develop and maintain an efficient, coordinated and economical system. Under Section 42 (2) mandates HERC to introduce open access as determined by the commission.
3. As per regulation 42 & 45 of regulation of 2012, the consumer was required to submit the respondent and other stake holders a schedule of power through open access by 10.00 A.M. of the day preceding on the date of transaction. The consumer has in later and spirit has submitted before 10.00 A.M. day ahead schedule for all days and the said submission is also supported by HVPNL vide its letter dated 28/09/2016 already filed with this Forum on 29/09/2016.
4. NOC issued by M/s HVPN is in the name of Group Leader, M/s Unitech Signature Tower for its associated member i.e. M/s Unitech Business Park, the NOC was also communicated by HVPN to DHBVN.
5. It is submitted that the respondent has admitted that the consumer has submitted combined morning bids in the name of M/s Unitech Signature Tower and has paid its consideration to another supplier through open access for the next day. The power purchased from another supplier cannot be misappropriated by the respondent merely on the ground that the bid was not submitted separately for each consumer. If such a technical plea is admitted it would only give a wrongful gain to the respondent, a State Instrumentality in this case on a mere technical ground and would defeat the purpose and object of section 42 of EA, 2003 for economical distribution and supply of power to the consumers and such plea not legally acceptable as held by Supreme Court in a catena of its judgments.
6. That all the addressees of the e-mails in question were addressed by the same and single click of the sending system of the computer. No fault on this account can be attributed on the complainant. As per regulation 45 of 2012 regulation, the submitted schedule of power drawl through OA submitted by consumer at 10.00 A.M. was to be considered as final for the purpose of working out slot wise admissible drawl from the respondent as per regulation 42.
7. That OA system is novice being introduced in 12/2013 and consumer resorted to this system for the first time in 2014 itself and its initial working problems are to be understood and appreciated in right prospective and no one should be allowed to have undue/wrongful game as is being emphasized in this case and not with the adherence of submission of the day ahead schedule.
8. That the OA system (for Group Leader Signature Tower and Unitech Business Park) where the complainant resorted to it was in May, 2014. The respondent vide letter dated 28/07/2015 worked out the excess refund at Rs.408880/- for the period May, 2014 to December, 2014 and later on vide letter dated 23/05/2016 this amount increased to Rs.1482178/-. The demand is not justified as initially complainant was allowed refund on the basis of verified data of HVPNL and then taking undue advantage of its position to hold money enhanced its demand. It is evident that there was due notice on the basis of in time submission of schedule by the complainant and duly verified by HVPNL. Therefore, the wrongful gain cannot be

allowed to the respondent merely because it is in a position to adjust the amount at its whims. The difficulty of the complainant may also be realized that if it does not pay as per the demand raised by the respondent the latter often resort to imposition of penalty and keeps the Damocles sword of disconnection on the head of the complainant.

The respondent vide their letter dated 20/10/2016 submitted through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide No. Ch-15/Forum-1418/GGN dated 20/10/2016 prayed before the Forum to allow some time for filing their submissions on the grounds of late receipt of rejoinder earlier submitted by the consumer. The counsel of the consumer objected for allowing more time in the case and also insisted for imposing cost on the respondent. The counsel of the consumer further prayed that subsequent hearings of the case, if any, be held at Gurgaon to avoid cost to the cost to which the Forum agreed.

After hearing both the parties, the Forum decided to allow time to the respondent to file their submissions in the interest of justice and the case was adjourned to the next date to be heard at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016.

The final proceedings in the case were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016. The counsel of consumer, counsel of the respondent along with SE/SO, Sr.A.O./OA, SDO/SO, Hisar and SDO of the concerned sub-division were present. The counsel of respondent has submitted the synopsis and argued that:-

- 1.1 The consumer challenging the demand to the tune of Rs.3983592/- raised by DHBVN on account of excess adjustment with respect to the power purchased by the complainant from open access during the period December, 2013 to December, 2014. Further, it has been alleged by the complainant that before scheduling open access power, it has complied with the provisions of HERC (Terms and conditions for grant of connectivity and open access for intra-state transmission and distribution system Regulation 2012.
- 1.2 In response to above, the respondent submits that in the present complainant two issues have been raised before this Forum. First Issue pertains to open access power sourced by the complainant on 06/02/2014, 10/02/2014, 13/02/2014 and 15/02/2014. The Second Issue pertains to bid by Unitech Signature Tower as group representative for the month of May, 2014 and June, 2014, was not considered with respect to Unitech Business Park A/C No. IND6-0012.

1. Issues for consideration:-

First Issue

- 1.1 It has been alleged by the complainant that it has given prior intimation to the respondent in terms of Regulation 42 of OA Regulation regarding the scheduling of open access power on 06/02/2014, 10/02/2014, 13/02/2014 and 15/02/2014. However the respondent is demanding the refund of adjustment made with respect to the said dates.
- 1.2 In response, the respondent submits that, it has not received any prior intimation regarding scheduling of open access power for the said dates from the complainant.

Further, the said fact has also been verified by the office of SE/SO. Moreover, the complainant has attached with its rejoinder a copy of its RTI response dated 28/09/2016 received from HVPNL, wherein it has been categorically mentioned that no intimation has been received for the said dates on the designated email ID of Xen/Open access. Therefore, the respondent was not made aware by the complainant regarding the scheduling of power through open access on the said dates. Owing to which the respondent in order to supply electricity with respect to the entire contract demand of the complainant on the said dates, purchased power from the concerned sources and have paid for the same. Therefore, the respondent is entitled under law to charge the complainant for the said power. In case the same is not recovered from the complainant, the respondent will suffer substantial loss, which will ultimately be passed on to the other consumers of the respondent.

Second Issue

It has been alleged by the complainant that the bidding schedule for Unitech Business Park A/C No. IND6-0012 was not approved by the respondent for the month of May, 2014 and June, 2014.

1.3 In response, the respondent submits that bidding schedule qua Unitech Business Park for the month of May, 2014 and June, 2014 was not given in terms of Regulation 8 of the OA Regulation. For case of reference the relevant portion of Regulation 8 is reproduced below:

Regulation 8:

“(3) A group of two or more consumers of a distribution licensee having a combined contract demand of 0.5 MVA or above and connected to the distribution system of licensee at 11 KV or above through an independent feeder emanating from a grid sub-station, shall also be entitled for seeking open access if all such consumers collectively apply for open access through a group representative to be nominated by all such consumers on that feeder provided that all such consumers shall have necessary infrastructure for time-block wise energy metering and accounting installed at their premises and provided further that schedule of power through open access of individual consumers shall also be supplied by the group representative.”

1.4 It is submitted that in terms of above provision a group of consumers can collectively apply for an open access through a group representative. Further, it has been categorically mentioned that schedule of power through open access of individual consumers shall also be supplied by the group representative. It is submitted that where the statute provides for a particular procedure, then the same has to be followed and no one can be permitted to act in contravention of the same. The same view has also been adopted by the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in Selvi J.Jayalithaa and Ors. Vs. State of Karnatka and Ors. (2014) 2 SCC 401. For ease of reference the relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced below:

“29. We find force in the submission advanced by the learned Attorney General that this Court generally should not pass any order in exercise of its extraordinary power under Article 142 of the Constitution to do complete justice if such order violates any statutory provisions. We do not intend to say that it would be illegal to extend the term of the special judge, but that it is a matter within the jurisdiction of the State in accordance with the relevant law.

There is yet an uncontroverted legal principle that when the statute provides for a particular procedure, the authority has to follow the same and cannot be permitted to act in contravention of the same. In other words, where a statute requires to do a certain thing in a certain way, the thing must be done in that way and not contrary to it at all. Other methods or mode of performance are impliedly and necessarily forbidden. The aforesaid settled legal proposition is based on a legal maxim “Exopressio unius est exclusion alterius”, meaning thereby that if a statute provides for a thing to be done in a particular way, then it has to be done in that manner and in no other manner and following any other course is not permissible.” Emphasises Supplied

1.5 In the present case collective schedule was submitted in the name of Unitech Signature Tower (Group Representative). However, the Unitech Signature Tower acting as a Group Representative failed to submit separate schedule for individual consumer i.e. Unitech Business Park. Therefore, the said schedule submitted for the months of May, 2014 and June, 2014 were considered only for Unitech Signature Tower and not for Unitech Business Park. It is pertinent to mention that the complainant from July, 2014 onwards is submitting schedule for each consumer in the group. Therefore, as the separate schedule of Unitech Business Park was not intimated, the respondent in order to supply electricity with respect to the entire contract demand of Unitech Business Park for the months of May, 2014 and June, 2014, purchased power from the concerned sources and have paid for the same. Therefore, the respondent is entitled under law to charge Unitech Business Park for the said power.

2. In light of the above submissions, it is most humbly submitted before this Forum that the demand to the tune of Rs.3983592/- has been legally raised by the respondent. Further, the present complaint is misconceived and devoid of merits. Therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief and this Forum may be pleased to dismiss the present complaint.

The Forum after taking into consideration the written submissions made by both the parties and arguments made by the Ld. Counsels of the parties, finds that the following issues are to be decided:-

1. **Is it statutory requirement that the consumer shall submit to the distribution licensee a schedule of power required through Open Access to licensee by 10.00 A.M. of the day preceding the day of transaction?**

The Forum decides that reply to this issue is in affirmative in terms of the State Electricity Regulator (HERC) Regulation No. 42 and 45 of Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission (Terms and conditions for grant of connectivity and open access for intra-State transmission and distribution system) Regulations, 2012. (Regulation No. 25/HERC/2012 of dated 11th January, 2012. The HERC Regulation (1st Amendment) Regulation 2013 under para 2.4 additional conditions for Open Access for day ahead transactions stipulates this to be essential for the planning and managing the drawal of the licensee from the grid as also in the load control in a cost effective manner unless a confirmed schedule of power through open access tied up for the next day by the open access consumers is made available to them (Distribution Licensee) sufficiently in advance. The total quantum of open access power for the next day i.e. for 00:00 hrs to 24 :00 hrs. of the following day, against day ahead transactions is known by the distribution licensee only between 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM of the previous day. Thereafter the Licensee has no time and are not in a position to take any corrective measures to affect alternations in its own schedule for surrendering any surplus power or for arranging more power in case of any shortfall as by that time distribution licensee on bids/schedules for energy drawal would have been approved by the power exchange/RLDC. The result is that they invariably are forced to under draw/overdraw or impose avoidable power cuts leading to financial losses and consequent additional burden for other consumers of the State due to actions of the open access consumers. That it would not be fair and justifiable if any losses of the licensee on account of energy transaction by open access consumer get passed on directly or indirectly to other consumers of the State. The Commission, after careful consideration of these aspects, has prescribed certain additional conditions for grant of open access and the foremost among these additional conditions is that for day ahead transactions, the open access consumers shall submit a confirmed slot wise schedule of power through open access and from the licensee for the next day at 10:00 hours of the previous day to the licensee and SLDC. In case there are any reductions in consumers open access schedule when it is finally accepted/cleared by the power exchange the consumer would be required to manage his drawal from the licensee as also his total drawal accordingly. In case he exceeds his admissible drawal in any time slot, penalty will be leviable. The principle that has been based upon to arrive at these conclusions is simple i.e. in case a consumer wants to avail the benefit of cheaper power, he should also be ready to face the associated risks thereon if any.

This is also substantiated from the fact that in case of under drawl of power by an open access consumer due to reasons attributable to him and within his control shall be compensated only to the extent of 10% of the entitled drawl in a time slot or up to 5% of the entitled drawl on aggregate basis for all the 96 time slots in a day and no compensation shall be payable by the distribution licensee for under drawl beyond these limits. This speaks of the importance of the discipline on the part of the open access consumers with an overall aim to maintain the grid security, discipline and also to save the distribution licensee from the losses on account of un-planned purchase of power, sale of surplus power at UI rates thereby burdening the consumers of the State as the power purchase expenses of the distribution licensee is a pass-through expense in the ARR as per HERC MYT Regulations- 2012.

2. **Has the consumer done the same?**

The Forum after consideration of all the facts noted that the consumer did send the day ahead information to the licensee for availing open access power through e-mails to various authorities including the State Transmission Utility (STU) Haryana Vidyut Prasaran Nigam Limited (HVPNL). The consumer has placed

on records before the Forum the copies of e-mail print outs of the e-mails sent by them for the dates in disputes as obtained by the consumers from HVPNL under RTI-2005 duly attested by the SE/STU, HVPNL, Panchkula. The details as placed before the Forum are that for the 6/02/2014 the e-mail indicates date of 5/02/2014 at 8:38 AM, for 10/02/2014 the e-mail indicates the date and time as 9/02/2014 at 8.22 AM, for 13/02/2014 it is 12/02/2014 at 9.24 AM and for 15/02/2014 it is 13/02/2014 at 9.34 AM. The e-mails as per printouts are shown addressed to sesodhbvn@gmail.com, hvpncecoml@yahoo.com, xenec1@yahoo.co.in, hvpnxencoml@gmail.com, secommercial@gmail.com, oahrysch@gmail.com, openaccesssharyana@gmail.com besides others. The respondent Nigam though disputes the e-mails and insisted that no such e-mails have ever been received by them but the respondent Nigam could not conclusively prove it technically or otherwise that these e-mails are not genuine or otherwise managed by the consumer in his own peculiar interest. Nor anything placed on records by the respondent Nigam that they have circulated particular mail IDs for all OA consumers for this purpose before 2014. Hence the Forum decides the issue in affirmative.

3. Has the licensee followed the relevant instructions before charging the amount or before debiting the same?

The Forum is of the opinion that U/s 56 of the Electricity Act-2003, the amount reasonably due to the consumer can be recovered by the licensee within a period of two years.

4. Regarding submission of collective day ahead schedule of open access power for the month of May and June, 2014 by the consumers, the Forum noted that the collective day ahead schedule in place of individual consumer wise schedule was submitted to the licensee and the same is duly acknowledged and not disputed by the licensee in his submissions before this Forum. However, the respondent Nigam is insisting that as per provisions of Regulation No. 8 of the OA regulation, there was a requirement of individual consumer wise day ahead schedule. Though the respondent Nigam has nowhere shown that it ever objected to such submissions from the consumers on these technical grounds before charging the consumer account with the amount in dispute. Nor any consequences of the filing of the collective schedule in terms of the finances have been placed on records. As the total quantum of group power to be sourced through open access on these particular dates was available with the Nigam, it cannot be said to be have affected the power planning of the Nigam or any consequential loss on this account as per the spirit of the open access regulations. The Forum finds force in the argument of the Counsel of the consumer that this is mere technical ground without any consequences hence the respondent Nigam cannot be allowed to gain unjust enrichment on this ground being the Nigam in monopolistic situation and a State Authority.

In view of the above, the Forum decides to allow the petition of the consumer. The amount if charged and already deposited by the consumer with the Nigam on this account, needs to be refunded/adjusted along with interest @ bank rate (RBI Bank rate) as applicable for the period the amount remained with the Nigam. No costs on either side. The case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to records.

(Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum-Chairman

(Rajesh Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005
Telephone No. 01662-223081
(website: www.dhbvn.com) (e-mail ID: cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com)

Case No. DH/CGRF-1388/2016
Date of Institution: 10.05.2016
Date of Hearing: 31.05.2016,28.06.2016,
29.07.2016,30.08.2016,
30.09.2016&28.10.2016
Date of Order: 29.11.2016

Before the Forum for Redressal of Consumer Grievances, DHBVN.

Present:-

Sh. Atul Pasrija, Technical Member-cum-Chairman
Sh. Rajesh Sharma, Member/Accounts
Sh. Satish Malik, Independent Member

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Anjana Bali W/o Sh. Vivek Bali, M/s The Close-North Apartment Owner Association, The Close-North Nirvana Country, Sector-50, Gurgaon regarding non-compliance of HERC orders.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

1. Xen, S/U Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.
2. SDO/Op. Sohna Road Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

1.Counsel of consumer.

For the Respondent:

1.Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar
2.SDO of Sohna Road Sub-Divn. & XEN,
S/U Divn., DHBVN, Gurgaon.

ORDER

Smt. Anjana Bali W/o Sh. Vivek Bali, M/s The Close-North Apartment Owner Association, The Close North Nirvana Country, Section-50, Gurgaon has got electricity connection bearing A/C No. 1066760000 under SDO/Op. Sohna Road Sub-Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon, hence this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the complaint stating therein that the petitioner society vide their complaint has approached this Forum for seeking relief in terms of order passed by the HERC whereby the HERC was pleased to hold that connected loads of lift, firefighting equipment and water supply pumps should henceforth be included as part of domestic load in use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in the earlier order passed by the Hon'ble Commission dated 13.10.2006 and the Nigam acting upon the same had issued revised schedule of tariff vide memo number 7/GM/Comml./R16/45/2010 dated 01/10/2010 and had included loads of lift, firefighting equipment and water supply pumps as part of domestic supply.

It has further been pleaded by the petitioner society that the aforesaid circular dated 01/10/2010 is to be read in conjunction with earlier sale circular No. D-29/2006 dated 21/07/2006 and as per the instructions of the Nigam single point connection applied by the Group Housing Society shall be released only in the name of residents associations and a Bulk Domestic Power Supply connection was sanctioned by the Nigam in favour of the petitioner society but the respondent is illegally charging tariff meant for "Bulk Supply Non-domestic connection" from the petitioner and the action of the Nigam qua wrongly categorizing the petitioner in Bulk supply non-domestic connection is in violation of their own order.

The petitioner has prayed for the following relief:-

2. The respondent may be issued notice and he may be directed to implement the order dated 03/09/2010 (Annexure A-2) and order dated 09/01/2013 passed by the Hon'ble Haryana Electricity Regulatory Commission and subsequently issued sales circulars by the competent authority and refund the amount illegally charged from the applicant along with interest.
3. Respondent may be ordered to pay interest to the applicant on ACD amount deposited with the respondent.
4. A rebate of 4% in case of supply at 11 KV in the energy consumption as recorded at single point supply meter shall be admissible as per this regulation. This rebate has not been given to the applicant by the respondent.
5. The applicant is seeking re-calculation of the tariff and consequent adjustment/refund of the dues illegally charged by the respondent.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the Nigam's version and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 31/05/2016 at Gurgaon for hearing of the case.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 31/05/2016, the representative of the consumer was present but neither respondent nor his representative was present. The Nodal Officer/CGRF requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for next date as the reply could not be prepared due to business of the respondent in repairing mass scale power failure in Gurgaon. Request granted.

The case was adjourned for next date with the direction to the SDO to submit proper reply on the next date of hearing.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 28/06/2016, the representative of consumer as well as respondent SDO was present. The respondent SDO submitted reply through Nodal Officer/CGRF, vide his memo No. 340 dated 27/06/2016 stating that;

1. M/s The Close North Apartment Owner Association. The Close North Nirvana Country, Sector-50, Gurgaon is a consumer having A/C No. 1066760000 with sanction load 5407.520 KW a BS-DS Single point connection at 11 KV supply voltage.
2. As per HERC order, BS-DS 15% common load admissible on sanctioned load (Common Load).
3. The BS-DS connection was sanctioned by The Chief Engineer/Op., DHBVN, Delhi vide memo No.4/WO/DRG1453/GGN dated 25/07/2008 (copy attached).
4. As per the CE/Op., DHBVN, Delhi, the partial load from 5407.520 KW with CD 5000 KVA to 1500 KW with CD 1500 KVA approved vide his memo No. 15/WO/DRG-1453/GGN dated 30/11/2010 due to commissioning/energisation of proposed 66 KV S/Stn., Sector-47, Gurgaon (copy attached).
5. In compliance of above, consumer submitted the test report of the approved partial load of 1500 KW of common load. Further test report had been verified by the then XEN with the remarks that :Tariff Charge BS-NDS as common load is >15% of sanctioned load" (copy of test report attached for reference) and the tariff of BS-NDS applicable to the consumer.
6. The energization of 66KV S/Stn., Sector-47, completed in Oct-2014 and demand notice issued to consumer vide M.No. 514 dated 07/04/2014 for full load release from 1500 KW to 5407.520 KW and in compliance of demand notice, consumer submitted the test report of 07/07/2014 along with detail of common load under 15% of connected load. At the time of verification of test report, no remarks has been appended by the then SDO for change of category from BS-NDS to BS-DS (copy of test report attached). Hence, billing done on BS-NDS tariff from 25/09/2014 to 06/2016. Now, change in category/tariff has been made in the system for billing as BS-DS and amount is to be re-calculated from 25/09/2014 to 06/2016 and adjusted in the consumer account after audit from the Chief Auditor, DHBVN, Hisar.

A copy of SDO reply has been handed over to the representative of consumer.

The representative of consumer stated that he will submit replication on the next date of hearing. The case was adjourned for next date with the direction to both the parties to remain present along with necessary documents to support their versions.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 29/07/2016, the counsel of consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. The representative of consumer Sh. Ashish Goel, Advocate submitted that the respondent Nigam vide memo No. 15/WO/DRG-1453/GGN dated 30/11/2010 had approved partial load from 5407.520 KW with contract demand 5000 KVA to 1500 KW with CD 1500 KVA. This memo had superseded earlier approval give vide DHBVN memo No. Ch-13/WO/DRG-1453/GGN dated 09/11/2010 and carries terms and conditions which are applicable to memo dated 30/11/2010 and for the just decision of the case, that copy of DHBVN memo No. Ch-13/WO/DRG-1453/GGN dated 09/11/2010 and 30/11/2010 which is in possession of the respondent Nigam may be directed to be produced and supplied. He submitted that the respondent may further be directed to supply detail of load along with copy of the test report dated 20/12/2010. These attachments which were not provided by Nigam giving details of all verified loads be produced and supplied.

He further submitted that the respondent may be directed to produce and supply the details of load which were not provided by Nigam along with copy of test report dated 08/07/2014 for just decision of the case.

A copy of this demand has been handed over to the representative of the SDO with the direction to supply these details to the consumer. Sh. Ashish Goel, Advocate of the consumer stated that he will submit replication after receipt of these documents from the respondent Nigam. The case was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 30/08/2016, the counsel of consumer as well as representative of respondent SDO was present. Sh. Ashish Goel, counsel for the petitioner submitted to the Forum rejoinder to the SDO's reply stating that the load of common facilities was not worked out correctly by the XEN at the time of verification of test report as he included the load of lift, water pump and fire fighting equipments in the category of common load whereas as per HERC directive, these should have been included in the domestic load (covered in 85% of the total load). Besides, interest on the ACD has not been allowed to his client by the respondent SDO. Copy of rejoinder has been handed over to the respondent.

During the argument, the representative of the petitioner stated that;

- 1) While calculating the load as per test report submitted at the time of seeking connection, the executive engineer concerned has included the load of lift, water pump and fire fighting equipments in NDS and since the total load of common facilities exceeds 15%, the connection has been released as Bulk Supply (NDS). However, the HERC vide its order dated 03/09/2010 has ordered that the load of lift, water pump and fire fighting equipments will be included in 85% i.e. DS category. Had the XEN followed this order, the total load of NDS category would have come down below 15% and the supply would have been given as bulk supply (DS). On account of wrong verification of the concerned XEN, DHBVN has collected tariff at NDS rate from the consumer from the date of connection (from 21/10/2010) to 01/08/2014. He stated that his client is entitled to the refund of excess amount charged from the consumer.
- 2) His client has not been paid interest on ACD from the date of connection till date.

The representative of the respondent SDO stated that he is not in a position to explain point number 1 and interest on ACD will be given to the consumer if not already given.

Due to non-presence of the SDO, there is no defence from the side of the respondent and there is no body to explain the position of the respondent. The Forum directs the respondent SDO to remain personally present on the next date of hearing otherwise cost will be imposed upon him.

After hearing the petitioner, the Forum directs both the parties to sit-together and work out the category of connection at the initial stage after subtracting the load of lift, water pump and fire fighting equipments. The outcome be reported to the Forum on the next date.

The respondent SDO was also directed to furnish his comments on the rejoinder in writing (if any). The case was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 30/09/2016, the counsel of the applicant Sh. Ashish Goel, Advocate and Sh. Raj Gopalan, Secretary, RWA and respondent SDO and CA were present.

On the last date of hearing, the Forum directed both the parties to sit-together and work out the category of connection at the initial stage after splitting of load of lift, firefighting and water pumps and to report the outcome to the Forum on the next date of hearing. Besides, respondent SDO was also required to furnish his comments on the rejoinder in writing (if any).

The respondent SDO stated that Sh. Raj Gopalan, Secretary, RWA visited him and they sat-together. It was found that the load of lift, water pumps and firefighting equipment was included by the applicant in the application itself in the load of common facilities. He said that at the time of application there were 116 flats in the society. Even if the loads of lift, water pumps and firefighting equipments are included in the domestic load (85%), the total load of other common facility exceeds 15%. Therefore, the recommendation of the then XEN to release BS(NDS) connection is correct.

The counsel for the consumer argued that there were 508 residential flats at the time of seeking connection and had this thing been kept in view the connection would have been BS(DS). He produced to the Forum list of Unitech customer data base which showed that before the date of connection ie. December, 2010, there were 508 flats already occupied. The SDO stated that this list cannot be relied after a period of 6 years as at the time of seeking connection, the consumer had himself provided that there were 116 flats occupied. The Forum agrees with the version of SDO.

The counsel for the consumer drew the attention of the Forum towards point No. 7 of Sales Circular No. D-29/2013 dated 25/06/2013, which provides that the load of common facilities for the residents of the group housing society admissible on bills under bulk supply (DS) tariff not to be more than 17.64% (15x100/85) of the total residential/domestic load of the group housing society/colony. In case of load of common facility being more than 17.64% of the

residential/domestic load, the excess load shall be treated as NDS load. The pro-rata consumption corresponding to this excess load along with other NDS load, if any, shall be billed as NDS tariff as directed in the regulations. He stated that the NDS tariff can be applied only on that proportionate consumption of common facilities which exceeds 17.64% of the domestic load or 15% of the total load.

The SDO objected to this. He stated that this point of charging NDS tariff only on that part which is in excess of 15% has been circulated in 2013 whereas the connection was released in December, 2010.

Thereafter, counsel of the consumer produced a copy of Sales Circular No. D-7/2010 dated 01/10/2010 of DHBVN. The perusal of the point No. 8 pertaining to bulk domestic supply states that this type of supply is available for the colony/group housing society having minimum 70 KW load out of which residential/domestic load should be at least 85% and the balance 15% load shall be for common facilities and no industrial activities will be permitted.

The counsel of the consumer stated that though this circular is silent as to the applicability of tariff in case where the load of common facilities exceeds 15% of the total load or 17.64% of the domestic load, keeping in view the concept of justice, equity and good conscience, the NDS tariff should be applied only on the excess load i.e. in excess of 15% of the total load or 17.64% of the domestic load of the common facilities and the pro-rata consumption corresponding to this excess load alongwith other NDS load, if any. Besides he stated that the nature of connection applied by the consumer cannot be changed merely on the ground of load of common facilities exceeding 15% of the total load suo-moto.

On the request of the respondent SDO, the hearing was adjourned for next date.

During the proceedings held at Gurgaon on 28/10/2016, the representatives of consumer as well as respondent SDO is present. The representative/counsel of consumer requested the Forum to adjourn the hearing for next date due to some unavoidable circumstances. Request granted. The hearing was adjourned for next date.

To-day, the proceedings were held at Gurgaon on 29/11/2016. The counsel of consumer and Respondent SDO & XEN, S/U Division, Gurgaon were present. The Counsel of the petitioners argued that Bulk Supply -DS tariff be made applicable to his client right since the date of connection (DoC) whereas the respondent XEN argued that actions of the Nigam functionaries on the face of the facts are appropriate, correct and in sync with the instructions of the DHBVN and regulation framed by the State Electricity Regulator (HERC) as applicable in this case. Both the parties agreed to conclude the hearing.

The Forum considered all the aspects of the case and framed following issues for decision;

1. Whether Bulk Supply (DS) tariff is applicable in the case of the consumer from the DoC i.e. 24/12/2010 or some later date.

The Forum noted that only partial load of 1500 KW with CD of 1500 KVA released in the first instance in the year 2010 as against the demand of consumer for 5407.520 KW with CD 5000 KVA due to system constraints. The respondent pointed out that load of lift, water pumps and firefighting equipment was included by the applicant in the application itself in the load of common facilities. At the time of application there were 116 flats in the society. Even if the loads of lift, water pumps and firefighting equipments are included in the domestic load (85%), the total load of other common facility exceeds 15%. The Forum also agrees with the respondent's version that the occupancy of 508 No. residential flats at the time of connection, for which the petitioner's counsel produced list of Unitech customers data base, cannot be relied after a period of 6 years as at the time of seeking connection, the consumer had himself provided that there were 116 flats occupied. Therefore, the Forum agrees with the recommendation of the then XEN to charge the connection under BS (NDS) category in the first instance in the year 2010.

However, the DHBVN vide Sales Circular No. D-4/2013 has adopted HERC Notification dated 9/01/2013 on single point supply to residential colonies or office cum residential complexes of employers, group housing societies and commercial cum residential complexes of developers, Regulations which prescribe the detailed procedure for billing in these cases as per attached Annexure-4 of these regulations.

The Forum, therefore, concluded that BS-NDS category tariff is applicable in the present case from the date of connection (DoC) to 8/01/2013. From 9/01/2013 to the date of release of balance load i.e. 25/09/2014, the billing of the consumer requires to be done as per Annexure-4 of the HERC notification dated 9/01/2013 duly adopted by DHBVN vide sales circular No. D-4/2013. The applicable category for

billing for the period from 25/09/2014 onwards is bulk supply domestic (BS-DS) as already agreed by the respondent SDO in his letter No. 340 dated 27/06/2016.

2. **Rebate of 4% in case of supply at 11 KV:** The respondent has not contended the benefit sought by the consumer. Hence the Forum decides that the rebate for single point supply at 11 KV be regulated to the consumer as per HERC notification dated 9/01/2013 and adopted by DHBVN vide SC No. D-4/2013.

3. **Interest on Security/ACD of the consumer.**

The respondent has not contended the relief sought by the consumer on this account. Hence the Forum decides that interest on ACD as per applicable Nigam/HERC rules and prescribed rates from time to time be allowed to the consumer through the bills within a month's time.

No costs on either side.

The application is partially allowed. Case is closed.

File be consigned to records.

Atul Pasrija)
Technical Member
-cum Chairman

(R K Sharma)
Member/Accounts

(Satish Malik)
Independent Member