



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

HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM
(website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID: cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3427 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	10.02.2021
DATES OF HEARING	02.03.2021, 17.03.2021, 02.04.2021, 01.07.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Smt. Sunita Devi W/o Sh. Lal Babu, MCF-51D, Bhagat Singh Colony, Ballabgarh regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.
SDO (OP) City-2 S/Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present.

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Smt. Sunita Devi W/o Sh. Lal Babu, MCF-51D, Bhagat Singh Colony, Ballabgarh has been a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 1337401000 under SDO (OP) City-2 Sub Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that she got her connection disconnected during 2012 after full and final payment. But now, respondent SDO vide no. 3548 dated 19.12.2020 issued notice for payment of outstanding dues of Rs.3994369/-, which was wrong. She approached respondent SDO for redressal of her grievance but no action has been taken. She has requested the Forum to redress her complaint.

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 02.03.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 02.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply but assured to submit detailed reply on next date of hearing. Forum directed respondent SDO to submit detailed reply, as assured. Now to come on next date of hearing on 16.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted his reply which was neither convincing nor in line with his point of view. The reply lacked proof of whether the complainant's connection had continued after 2012 as claimed by him in his reply. The complainant on his part submitted that since he had not received any bill after his disconnection in 2012, how could the subdivision claim that the connection continued after the disconnection had been made and the meter had been removed by the Nigam's lineman sh. Than Singh. The SDO was directed to come up with complete facts of the case and to base his reply in future on the documentary evidences. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.04.2021. Complainant as well as respondent SDO were present. SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 3932 dated 01.04.2021. The reply did not contain all the information which Forum wanted in lieu of the complainant's stand that the connection had in fact been disconnected in 2012. The SDO was directed to submit in detail the following information as discussed in last hearings also:

1. Copy of ledger from 4/2013 to 6/2014 and from 7/2014 to 12/2014
2. Copy of MCO dated 4/2013 and reading detail of 43488
3. Copy of CA 21/22 and m7t lab report and copy of DCO effected on 17.03.2016

Now to come up for hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021. Complainant as well as respondent SDO were present. SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 4217 dated 01.07.2021. The reply

did not contain any information or proof of actual disconnection of the connection. The complainant maintained that the connection had been disconnected in 2012 but the subdivision said that there was no proof available in record which could substantiate complainant's contention. The Forum directed the SDO to place on record the complete consumption data and the meter reading record / ledger etc. right since 4/2013 till the time subdivision says the connection was disconnected. Now to come up for hearing on 02.08.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson

	FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM (website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID: cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)
---	--

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3314 / 2020
DATE OF INSTITUTION	02.12.2020
DATES OF HEARING	05.01.2021, 02.02.2021 & 02.03.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. C.S. Paul, H.No.122, Sector-7A, Faridabad
regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn. DHBVN, Ballabgarh.
SDO (OP) S/U S/Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present

For the Respondent: Respondent SDO

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. C.S. Paul, H.No.122, Sector-7A, Faridabad has an electricity connection bearing account No. 0033001000 under SDO (OP) S/U S/Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh. The Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant filed the present complaint stating that his premises remained closed from April to Dec., 2018. New meter was installed in Jan., 2019. From January to Oct., 2020 he was paying bill regularly. Load was reduced from 250 kVA to 55 kVA in April, 2014. He paid fixed charges regularly up to Oct., 2016. Respondent Nigam was issuing wrong bill since Nov., 2016 to Dec., 2018. He requested many times the respondent SD but no action has been taken so far. He requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 05.01.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held on 05.01.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO requested for another date. Request allowed.

The proceedings were held on 2.2.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 7202 dated 2.2.21 stating that Rs.528492/- was adjustable due to wrong bill issued for the period Nov., 2016 to June 2017 due to non-adjustment of LPSC and punching of wrong reading in the record. LPSC was also levied up to Jan., 2021 and case sent to CBO and is pending as yet. Forum directed respondent SDO to pursue with CBO personally and get rectified bill delivered to the complainant within 15 days.

Proceedings were held on 2.3.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply, however, stated that the case was still pending with CBO. Complainant argued that his account needed to be overhauled since April, 2012 to date. Forum directed respondent SDO to overhaul complainant account since April, 2012 to date and submit detailed reply. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.04.2021. SDO was present but Complainant sent in a message for exemption from attending the hearing. SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 7397 dated 04.03.2021 and informed that complete details have been submitted to the CBO for making corrections as the binder was in initiated stage. Requested for another date. Now to come up for hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021. SDO as well as the complainant were present. SDO had submitted reply vide memo no. 7397 dated 04.03.2021 during last hearing and both the parties were asked to exchange information specifically w.r.t. the date of disconnection and the M&P record of checking. The complainant argued that unless the date of disconnection gets corrected, there can be no solution of this grievance. The Forum directed the SDO to verify from M&P record the actual date of disconnection and come up with complete details with due certification by his office. Now

to come up for hearing on 15.07.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson



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

**HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM
(website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)**

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3441 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	15.02.2021
DATES OF HEARING	02.03.2021, 02.04.2021, 01.07.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Col. Gopal Singh, President, The Zhuku Co-operative Group Housing Society Ltd., Plot No. 16, Sector-65, Ballabgarh regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.
SDO (OP) City-1 S/Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present.

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Col. Gopal Singh, President, The Zhuku Co-operative Group Housing Society Ltd., Plot No. 16, Sector-65, Ballabgarh has been a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 32SS11-1198 under SDO (OP) City-1 Sub Divn., DHBVN, Ballabgarh and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that respondent Nigam was issuing bill without reading on average basis for long. Further, converted the connection from DS to NDS category and charged additional amount since the date of connection. He approached respondent SDO for redressal of his grievance but no action has been taken. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 02.03.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 02.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 380 dated 2.3.2021 stating that said connection was running in DS category instead of NDS. This was a common area connection in the society. Now, the category has been changed from DS to NDS and new account no. is generated and account overhauled. Complainant was not satisfied. He argued that the common area connection should be treated under DS category and accordingly he had applied for. Respondent SDO was directed to intimate rule under which he had changed the category of connection since date of connection and that he would physically verify the site to ascertain the facts whether the connection should be under DS or NDS category as per rules. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.04.2021. SDO as well as the complainant were present. SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 650 dated 01.04.2021 stating that the nos. of flats have been physically verified and report submitted. The complainant also submitted papers in support of his claim that loads of water supply, lifts and fire fighting should be a part of domestic usage and not commercial usage. SDO is directed to submit reply specific to the HERC guidelines to consider usage of water supply, fire fighting and lifts under domestic category. The SDO was also directed to submit specific replies to the other issues raised by the complainant. Now to come up for hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021. SDO as well as the complainant were present. SDO had submitted reply vide memo no. 650 dated 01.04.2021 on the last date of hearing stating that the nos. of flats had been physically verified and report submitted. The complainant also had submitted papers in support of his claim that loads of water supply, lifts and fire-fighting should be a part of domestic usage and not commercial usage. SDO was directed to submit reply specific to the HERC guidelines to consider usage of water supply, fire-fighting and lifts under domestic category. The SDO again submitted reply today vide memo no. 1198 dated 01.07.2021 simply stating that the file of case was not available in his office. This casual approach of the subdivision was viewed very seriously. The SDO was directed to submit specific replies to all the

issues raised by the complainant with reference to the HERC regulations and orders in that regard. Now to come up for hearing on 02.08.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson



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

HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM
(website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3480 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	08.03.2021
DATES OF HEARING	02.04.2021, 01.07.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Nitin Khurana C/o M/S Melrose Overseas, 32,
DLF Industrial Area, Phase I, Faridabad regarding unlawful billing charges

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Old Faridabad
SDO (OP) Mathura Road, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present.

For the Respondent: SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Nitin Khurana c/o M/S Melrose Overseas has an industrial connection under Mathura Road subdivision of Faridabad and therefore, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that during their meter stopped during March 2020 during lock down period and their factory remained closed as per government orders and could resume partial operations only in the last week of May 2020 when the lockdown was partially lifted. That they continued to get bills on average basis and despite their continuous pursual with subdivision, their meter could only be changed during September 2020. That the charging on average basis for the period during which the factory was closed due to lockdown was absolutely wrong and unlawful. He approached respondent SDO for redressal of his grievance but no action has been taken. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 02.04.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 02.04.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply but apprised the Forum that he was aware of the issues raised by the complainant and that he would be able to submit detailed reply by the next date of hearing. The complainant submitted some papers in support of his claim that the factory remained closed during the lock down period. Now to come on next date of hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply but requested for another date for submission of detailed reply. At the same time, the complainant was also directed to submit as a proof the copies of GST return etc. to prove that the factory had remained closed during the lock down period. Now to come on next date of hearing on 15.07.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson



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

HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM
(website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID: cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3374 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	11.01.2021
DATES OF HEARING	02.02.2021, 02.03.2021, 17.03.2021, 01.07.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Vimlesh Kumar Q.No. 1274 Type-III, NH-IV,
NIT, Faridabad regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Old Faridabad.
SDO (OP) No.4 S/Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present.

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Vimlesh Kumar Q.No. 1274 Type-III, NH-IV, NIT, Faridabad has been consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 8076147757 under SDO (OP) No.4 Sub Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that bill issued for the month of Oct., 2020 for 81138 units for 249 days of Rs.62602/- was wrong without slab benefit and abnormally high. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 2.2.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 2.2.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 536 dated 29.1.2021 stating that due to wrong binder, bill of the complainant had been generated on average basis. Now the binder of the complainant has been changed and the bill as generated is as per actual reading and correct. Complainant was not satisfied. He argued that 8138 units for 249 days was abnormally high. As per advice of the Forum, he agreed for testing of his meter. Forum directed complainant to deposit testing fee and respondent SDO to get tested the meter from the LAB. in his presence and overhaul complainant account as per test report.

Proceedings were held on 2.3.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 682 dated 01.03.2021 stating that complainant meter had been got checked from Lab. and found within permissible limit, copy placed on record. Complainant was not satisfied. Forum directed respondent SDO to get the reading retrieved for the period as maximum as possible and provide consumption data of corresponding period of previous year. Complainant was also directed to pay atleast Rs.20000/- within 7 days. Now to come on next date of hearing on 16.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 790 dated 16.03.2021 stating that the account had been reconciled and the bill was correct. Reply of the SDO was not in line with the directions given in the last hearing. The SDO was directed to get the reading retrieved for the period as maximum as possible and provide consumption data of corresponding period of previous year. Now to come on next date of hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 1288 dated 01.07.2021 stating that the account had been reconciled and the bill was correct. Reply of the SDO was not in line with the directions given in the last hearing. The SDO was directed to get the reading retrieved for the period as maximum as possible and provide consumption data of corresponding period of previous year. The SDO was again directed to place on record the consumption data of the complainant

account from the date of connection for assessing the correctness of his reply. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.08.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. R.P. Uniyal and others, R/o Park Floors-2, Flat No. T-13/G004, Sector-76, Faridabad has been the consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 1202690000 under SDO (OP) Badrola S/Divn. DHBVN, Faridabad. The Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

The complainant has filed the present complaint stating that the builder was not complying with the HERC regulation dated 22.4.2020 and was deducting additional amount from their pre-paid meters after tempering and changing the setting of the meter for the purposes other than electricity namely common area maintenance charges, GST etc. He requested the forum to redress his complaint.

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 03.11.2020 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceeding was held on dated 03.11.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. SDO did not submit reply. Forum directed respondent SDO to send copy of complaint to the builder/RWA of GHS seeking their reply on the complaint stipulating the period of not more than 7 days. He was also directed to depute area in charge/JE to verify the facts of complaint as per HERC notification dated 22.4.2020 and thereafter submit detailed reply to the Forum with a copy to complainant before the date of hearing.

Proceeding was held on dated 03.12.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and respondent SDO were present. SDO submitted reply vide memo.no.1940 dated 02.12.2020 stating that as per Forum direction, a notice to M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd. and M/s BPTP Ltd. was issued vide memo.no. 1837 dated 17.11.2020 and no. 1938 dated 02.12.2020 respectively. But no reply has been received till date. Further, monthly electricity bill of M/s Countrywide as demanded by the complainant were also provided. The representative of M/s BPTP telephonically requested for another date. During hearing representative of BPTP, Mr. Faisal confirmed that there was no disconnection till date of any allottee. Forum directed the representative of M/s Countrywide/BPTP not to effect disconnection of any allottee due to any reason except non-payment of electricity bill, till decision of case. Respondent SDO was also directed to depute area in charge/JE to verify the facts of complaint as per HERC notification dated 22.4.2020 and thereafter submit detailed reply to the Forum with a copy to complainant before the date of hearing.

Proceeding was held on dated 05.01.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. SDO submitted reply dated 05.01.2021 stating that as per Forum direction, another notice to M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd. and M/s BPTP Ltd. were issued. But no reply was received till date. The representative of M/s BPTP telephonically requested for another date. Request allowed.

Proceedings were held on 08.01.2021. All, the complainant, the respondent SDO and representative of Country wide / BPTP were present. The complainant and the representative of BPTP submitted that they had held a meeting recently wherein some solution / settlement has been arrived at for the period prior to coming into force of the latest regulation on Single Point Connection in 2020. Forum directed the representative of Country wide / BPTP that they have no option but to implement the new regulation as such. Mr. Rajiv Gupta appearing for BPTP assured that they would not violate any of the provisions of the Regulation and would come up with a detailed reply before the next date on 19.01.2021. Forum accepted his submissions. Now to come up for hearing on 19.01.2021.

Proceedings were held on 19.01.2021 wherein all the parties were present. The developer submitted their set of papers showing the format of billing the individual consumers but it was disputed by the complainant. It was mutually agreed between the complainant and the developer that they would meet again on 28.01.2021 and would try to reach at some conclusion. The next date was fixed as 02.02.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.02.2021 but the parties requested for another date owing to their ongoing meetings to verify each other's record. Now to come up on the next date of hearing on 12.02.2021.

Proceedings were held on 12.02.2021. Respondent SDO, the complainant and Mr. Saxena from M/S BPTP were present. Again, the dispute remained the same between the complainant and the developer M/S BPTP. After hearing lot of allegations and counter allegations by both the parties, the Forum decided that officers of DHBVN should visit the site and submit a detailed report to the Forum. Therefore, the Forum directed XEN Greater Faridabad Division to form a committee of 2 nos. SDOs and 2 nos. JEs (including the SDO and JE of the area) and to visit the site and submit a detailed report to the Forum before the next date of hearing 02.03.2021 specifically covering the following points in addition to their other observations, if any:

1. By which meter, the monthly input power to Park Floors-2 is measured and where it is installed
2. How the consumption of common area is measured. Are the meters, if separately installed, are in working order
3. Format of the electricity bill which the developer provides to the residents on monthly / bimonthly basis
4. Are the dual energy meters functional to record the DHBVN and generator supply separately.
5. Do the total input energy to Park Floors match the sum total of the units for which the bills are collected from the residents by the developer

Now to come up for hearing on 02.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.03.2021. Complainant as well as SDO were present. But from the builder side, a Vakalatnama was received and next date of hearing was sought. On his part, the SDO submitted a brief report on the issues raised by the Forum on the last date of hearing. Even though the report of respondent SDO clarified some important issues, yet it was felt that it lacked in so many ways and there were some very important issues which had not been touched in his report. Therefore, the Forum directed XEN Greater Faridabad Division and the respondent SDO to further conduct a survey of the area and submit a self-speaking report on the following issues:

1. A single line diagram showing the location of single point connection, nos. of plotted colonies / high rise buildings / other areas / societies which are fed from this single point connection
2. Whether, at the entry point of each of these areas as mentioned in para 1 above, any reference meter is installed and working on the basis of which the builder / developer company raises the bills to its residents / occupants
3. Whether the reference meter installed, if any, at the entry point of each of such areas also records the DG set energy or not
4. Are the DG set generated units recorded separately in dual energy meters installed for individual houses and common area power requirements.
5. How does the builder / developer match the total energy billed to them by DHBVN in a month with the sum total of bills of individual consumption of residents every month raised by the builder / developer?
6. Are the dual energy meters installed for recording common area energy functional
7. What is the ratio of domestic energy consumption viz.-a-viz. common area service consumption
8. Checking by committee be done in the shape of checking formats LL 1
9. Any other important point which comes to the notice of committee during checking

The report should be comprehensive and should cover all the above issues listed. Now, the matter to come up for hearing on the next date 16.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021. The respondent SDO, the Complainant and Advocate of M/s Country Wide Promoters Mr. R P Kansal were present. The SDO informed that they had tried to survey the area and submit the report but there was no cooperation from the developer M/s Country Wide Promoters. The matter was raised before the Advocate and he was requested to coordinate a meeting of the respondent SDOs with his client and to ask them to furnish all the details related to the issues listed in the earlier hearings. The SDOs were directed to submit the detailed report to the Forum latest by

05.04.2021 with copies to the complainant as well the developer M/S Country Wide Promoters. Also, the complainant and the developer M/S Countrywide Promoters through their advocate were directed to submit their respective observations / comments on the SDO's report latest by 10.04.2021 so that detailed arguments can be held on next date of hearing 15.04.2021. Now to come up for hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021. The respondent SDO and the Complainants were present but the Advocate of M/s Country Wide Promoters Mr. R P Kansal informed on phone that due to his preoccupation in a court, he was unable to attend the proceedings and therefore requested for another date. The Forum reminded him of the promise he had made during the last hearing and informed that his client did not associate / cooperate the team of subdivision staff in bringing out the facts at the ground. The counsel promised that he would ask his clients to cooperate and help in bringing out facts. The SDO was directed by the Forum to take the matter seriously and submit detailed report on the ground realities as also directed in the last hearing with specific answers to the questions raised. The SDOs were directed to submit the detailed report to the Forum latest by 12.07.2021 with copies to the complainant as well the developer M/S Country Wide Promoters. Also, the complainant and the developer M/S Countrywide Promoters through their advocate were directed to submit their respective observations / comments on the SDO's report latest by 15.07.2021 so that detailed arguments can be held on next date of hearing 15.07.2021. Now to come up for hearing on 15.07.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson

	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 HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM (website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)
---	---

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3286 / 2020
DATE OF INSTITUTION	19.11.2020
DATES OF HEARING	03.12.2020, 05.01.2021, 8.1.2021, 02.02.2021, 12.02.2021, 02.3.2021, 17.03.2021, 01.07.2021

BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Umesh Kumar Prabhakar, H.No.997, Sector-17, Faridabad regarding supply problem.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Greater Faridabad.
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Kheri Kalan.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Present.

For the Respondent: Respondent SDO

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Umesh Kumar Prabhakar, H.No.997, Sector-17, Faridabad is a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 1202690000 under SDO (OP) Sub Divn., DHBVN, Kherikalan and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that his grievance related to non-erection and commissioning of adequate electrical infrastructure for the plotted colony across sector 75-89, Faridabad developed by the colonizer M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd. The Colonizer has taken BulkSupply DS connection for 928 dwelling units despite the fact that habitation has now taken place by more than 5000 families and at the onset of summer, there are long power cuts on account of inadequate power supply or inadequate power infrastructure. Moreover, the developer has charged Rs.721/- per square yard from thousands of allottees. This is a sheer case of siphoning of funds collected by the developer for laying inadequate infrastructure. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 03.12.2020 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The first proceeding was held on 03.12.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide memo.no. 4236 dated 01.12.2020 stating that the matter pertains to colonizer M/s Countrywide Promoters. There are various litigations pending at various level against the said colonizer, as such, requested to allow at least four weeks' time for submission of reply. Forum directed respondent SDO to send copy of said complaint to the colonizer seeking their reply on the complaint stipulating the period of not more than 7 days. He was also directed to depute area incharge/JE to verify the facts of complaint as per HERC notification dated 22.4.2020 and thereafter submit detailed reply to the Forum with a copy to complainant before the next date of hearing. Now to come on next date of hearing on 05.01.2021.

Proceeding was held on dated 05.01.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant and respondent SDO were present. SDO submitted reply dated 05.01.2021 stating that as per Forum direction, another notices to M/s Countrywide Promoters Pvt. Ltd. and M/s BPTP Ltd. were issued. But no reply is received till date. The complainant also submitted some queries which were handed over to respondent SDO for reply. The representative of M/s BPTP telephonically requested for another date. Request allowed. Now to come on next date of hearing on 08.01.2021.

Proceedings were held on 08.01.2021. The Complainant, the respondent SDO and Mr. Rajiv Gupta of BPTP / Country Wide were present. Complainant Mr. Umesh Prabhakar raised the issue that despite the infrastructure cost having been recovered from the individual allottees, the developer M/S Country Wide Promoters / BPTP had not erected the requisite electrical infrastructure. He placed on record copies of certain agreement papers between the buyer and the developer to support his argument. Mr. Rajiv Gupta of BPTP submitted that he would come up with a detailed reply by the next date after which the matter can be argued at length. Forum directed Mr. Rajiv Gupta to go through the papers and other verbal submissions made by the complainant and submit their detailed point wise reply before the next date 19.01.2021. Now to come up hearing on the next date 19.01.2021.

Proceedings were held on 19.01.2021 wherein complainant, the developer and the respondent SDO were present. Mr. Gupta from Country Wide Promoters submitted details of the EDC and other charges paid to the state authorities. Copies of the same were also handed over to the complainant. During arguments, it was decided that the complainant and the developer would again sit together on 28.01.2021 and would exchange all other relevant papers in the interest of justice and would also place the same on record of the Forum and that the case would again be heard on 02.02.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.02.2021 wherein complainant was present but the developer sought some more time to submit some more papers on the issue. Request was granted. Now to come up for hearing on 12.02.2021.

Proceedings were held on 12.02.2021. Complainant, the respondent SDO and Mr. Saxena from the developer were present. The main point of disagreement between the complainant and the developer remained the same. Complainant argued that since the developer had collected all the charges at the time of sale of property, it was duty of the developer to erect adequate electrical infrastructure out of the money so collected whereas the developer argued that since EDC collected by HUDA / DTCP included the charges against necessary electrical infrastructure including HT lines from nearest substation, it was for the government agencies to put in place the adequate electrical infrastructure. On the issue, as again raised by the complainant regarding inadequacy in the infrastructure and the source of supply, the Forum decided that a committee of Nigam officers should visit the area and submit a single line diagram of the system laid so far and the points of measurement of power flow and the billing mechanism. Therefore, the Forum directed XEN Greater Faridabad to constitute a committee of 2 nos. SDOs and 2 nos. JEs to go into the concerns of Forum explained above and to submit a detailed report before the next date of hearing

on 02.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 02.03.2021. Complainant as well as SDO were present. But from the builder side, a Vakalatnama was received and next date of hearing was sought. On his part, the SDO submitted a brief report on the issues raised by the Forum on the last date of hearing. Even though the report of respondent SDO clarified some important issues, yet it was felt that it lacked in so many ways and there were some very important issues which had not been touched in his report. Therefore, the Forum directed XEN Greater Faridabad Division and the respondent SDO to further conduct a survey of the area and submit a self-speaking report on the following issues:

1. A single line diagram showing the location of single point connection, nos. of plotted colonies / high rise buildings / other areas / societies which are fed from this single point connection
2. Whether, at the entry point of each of these areas as mentioned in para 1 above, any reference meter is installed and working on the basis of which the builder / developer company raises the bills to its residents / occupants
3. Whether the reference meter installed, if any, at the entry point of each of such areas also records the DG set energy or not
4. Are the DG set generated units recorded separately in dual energy meters installed for individual houses and common area power requirements.
5. How does the builder / developer match the total energy billed to them by DHBVN in a month with the sum total of bills of individual consumption of residents every month raised by the builder / developer?
6. Are the dual energy meters installed for recording common area energy functional
7. What is the ratio of domestic energy consumption viz.-a-viz. common area service consumption
8. Checking by committee be done in the shape of checking formats LL 1
9. Any other important point which comes to the notice of committee during checking
10. Name of the agency who raises electricity bills to individual residents and whether it is authorized to do so under the law

The report should be comprehensive and should cover all the above issues listed. Now, the matter to come up for hearing on the next date 16.03.2021.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021. The respondent SDO, the Complainant and Advocate of M/s Country Wide Promoters Mr. R P Kansal were present. The SDO informed that they had tried to survey the area and submit the report but there was no cooperation from the developer M/s

Country Wide Promoters. The matter was raised before the Advocate and he was requested to coordinate a meeting of the respondent SDOs with his client and to ask them to furnish all the details related to the issues listed in the earlier hearings. The SDO were directed to submit the detailed report to the Forum latest by 05.04.2021 with copies to the complainant as well the developer M/S Country Wide Promoters. Also, the complainant and the developer M/S Countrywide Promoters through their advocate were directed to submit their respective observations / comments on the SDO's report latest by 10.04.2021 so that detailed arguments can be held on next date of hearing 15.04.2021. Now to come up for hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021. The respondent SDO and the Complainant were present. but the Advocate of M/s Country Wide Promoters Mr. R P Kansal informed on phone that due to his preoccupation in a court, he was unable to attend the proceedings and therefore requested for another date. The Forum reminded him of the promise he had made during the last hearing and informed that his client did not associate / cooperate the team of subdivision staff in bringing out the facts at the ground. The counsel promised that he would ask his clients to cooperate and help in bringing out facts. The SDO submitted a report a copy of which was handed over to the complainant. The complainant pointed out that the committee of SDOs had missed the very important and basic issue of the complaint regarding the state of inadequate infrastructure installed by the developer. He informed that the infrastructure installed was merely sufficient for around 2000 residents whereas the number of residents had grown to around 15000. The Forum also observed that while submitting the report, the committee of SDOs missed out on the very basic issue of inadequate infrastructure. The SDOs were supposed to bring out on record the total infrastructure installed and the nos. of residents to whom the supply was being given through this inadequate infrastructure and the nos. of hours for which the supply was being cut by the developers to its residents of the area in question. The SDOs were directed to reinvestigate / revisit the area with reference to the specific query raised in the complaint and the concern expressed by the Forum in previous hearings, specifically the state of inadequate infrastructure and as to how the developer was supplying electricity to its consumers with limited capacity of the feeder he had got sanctioned earlier. Now to come up for hearing on 15.07.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson



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

**HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM
(website: www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)**

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3477 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	08.03.2021
DATES OF HEARING	17.03.2021, 01.07.2021

**BEFORE THE
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
NARESH MEHTA	MEMBER ACCOUNTS
MANOJ YADAV	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Gaganpreet Singh, 137, 1st Floor, Back Side Rear Left, Ashoka Enclave 1, Sector 34, Faridabad.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Old Faridabad.
SDO (OP) Mathura Road, DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Not Present.

For the Respondent: Respondent SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Gaganpreet Singh, resident of 137, 1st Floor, Back Side Rear Left, Ashoka Enclave 1, Sector 34, Faridabad.is a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 4256350000 under SDO (OP) Sub Divn., Mathura Road, DHBVN, Faridabad and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that the bill issued in the month of January 2021 for 7111 units for the period 06.04.2019 to 16.01.2020 for Rs. 48002/- was abnormally high and without any slab benefit. The old meter showing 682.85 units for the period 06.04.2019 to 15.01.2020 and new meter showing 6429 units for 1 day. This was not understandable. He approached the respondent SDO for redressal of his grievance but no action was taken. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 17.03.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant was not present but representative of respondent SDO was present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply and requested for another date to come up with details of the case. The complainant was contacted on phone who told that even though he had paid all the bills up to date yet the respondent DHBVN was sending their staff for disconnection every now and then. Forum directed respondent SDO to get the MCO updated from the actual date of replacement of meter and to get the bill corrected duly overhauled. No coercive action should be taken till final decision of the case. Now to come on next date of hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant as well as the respondent SDO was present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply and requested for another date to come up with details of the case. The complainant told that even though he had paid all the bills up to date yet the respondent DHBVN was sending their staff for disconnection every now and then. Forum directed respondent SDO to get the MCO updated from the actual date of replacement of meter and to get the bill corrected duly overhauled. No coercive action should be taken till final decision of the case. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.08.2021.

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson

M/S ATC Mobile Towers, House no. 1519, Near Hanuman Mandir, Sector 28, Faridabad.is a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 6281790000, 6159790000 and 7644001000 under SDO (OP) Sub Divn., No. 4, DHBVN, Faridabad and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that he had applied for permanent disconnection of all the above three nos. connections, removal of meters from site, issuance of final bills and the issuance of NOC. The subdivision has not been effecting the same. He approached the respondent SDO for redressal of his grievance but no action was taken. He has requested the Forum to redress his complaint.

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 17.03.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 17.03.2021 at Faridabad. Neither the complainant nor the SDO were present. SDO requested telephonically for another date for submission of reply and effecting of the PDCOs. Forum directed respondent SDO to get the PDCOs effected and to issue the NOCs after completing all the necessary formalities before the next date of hearing and to submit the compliance. The complainant is also directed to visit the subdivision and to get the respective sites identified for immediate solution of his grievances. Now to come on next date of hearing on 15.04.2021.

Proceedings were held on 01.07.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant as well as SDO were present. SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 1201 dated 01.07.2021 stating that PDCO had been effected and that the account would be closed once the complainant pays the final bill. The complainant informed that he was ready to pay the final bill but it has not yet been told to him how much to pay. The Forum directed respondent SDO to deliver the final payable amount to the complainant and also to issue NOC after the due payment is received. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.08.2021.

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
Member Accounts

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson