



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 / 3097 / 2020
DATE OF INSTITUTION	27.07.2020
DATES OF HEARING	14.08.2020, 02.09.2020, 01.10.2020, 03.11.2020, 03.12.2020, 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 M/s Krishna Rice Mill, Old GT Road, Hodel
(Palwal) regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn. DHBVN, Hodel.
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Hodel.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO

INTERIM ORDER

M/s Krishna Rice Mill, Old GT Road, Hodel (Palwal) has an electricity connection bearing account No. 2726901000 under SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Hodal. The Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant filed the present complaint stating that they have an electric connection having sanctioned load of 415 kW. Respondent Nigam charged Rs.133481/-, Rs.133481/-, Rs.178462/- and Rs.121063/- as ACD/Sundry charges during the month of April, May, July & December, 2019 respectively. When enquired from the office, they told that the amount of Rs.400443/- charged in excess would be refunded being charged wrongly. But, till date, excess amount charged as ACD neither refunded nor adjusted. They requested the Forum to redress their complaint and get refunded/adjusted the excess amount along with interest.

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 14.08.2020 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

The proceedings were held on 14.08.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant was present but none from respondent SDO. However, as per telephonic talk with Xen. (OP) Hodel, he informed that the facts are in notice with him and the complaint will be redressed and reported to the Forum within ten days.

The proceedings were held on 02.09.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO vide his letter dated nil informed that ACD amount of Rs.400443/- has been refunded through CBO on 31.08.2020 and this will be reflected in the bill to be issued in the month of Sep. he further stated that surcharge on the above amount will also be adjusted in the subsequent month's bill. Forum directed respondent SDO to ensure refund of surcharge and adjustment of excess ACD amount along with interest after recalculation as per instructions within 20 days.

The proceedings were held on 01.10.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and representative of respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO vide his letter dated 1420 dated 01.10.2020 informed that surcharge on excess ACD was adjusted vide sundry no. 48/R45 and sent to CBO on 31.08.2020 and this would be reflected in the next bill. Forum directed respondent SDO to ensure release of excess ACD amount along with interest after recalculation as per instructions within 20 days.

The proceedings were held on 03.11.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant representative was present but respondent SDO was not present. As per telephonic talk with Xen. (OP) Hodel, he confirmed that the grievance of complainant has been resolved but rectification still pending from CBO. Forum directed respondent SDO to get the bill rectified from CBO and submit detailed reply personally on next date of hearing on 03.12.2020.

The proceedings were held on 03.12.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply

vide memo.no. 1769 dated 27.11.2020 stating therein that amount of excess ACD has been allowed but surcharge Rs.24609/- and interest on ACD Rs.23725/- is still pending at CBO level which will be allowed after approval. So far as interest on excess ACD as charged earlier and refunded in Sep., 2020 is concerned, it will be reviewed and if admissible, will be processed for refund. Forum directed respondent SDO to ensure compliance, as assured, before next date of hearing on 05.01.2021.

The proceedings were held on 05.01.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide memo.no. 1944 dated 31.12.2020 stating therein that amount surcharge Rs.24609/- and interest on ACD Rs.23725/- was sent to CBO but CBO has approved Rs.17784/-. This office is reviewing it and will submit detailed reply on next date of hearing. Forum directed respondent SDO to ensure compliance, as assured, before next date of hearing on 02.02.2021.


The proceedings were held on 02.02.2021 at Faridabad. None of complainant and respondent SDO was present. Respondent SDO telephonically requested for another date to submit detailed reply. Request allowed.

The proceedings were held on 02.03.2021 at Faridabad. Representative of both complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO placed on record copy of CBO approval of Rs.17784/-. Forum viewed seriously casual approach of respondent SDO and directed to review it and submit detailed reply on next date of hearing. Now to come on next date of hearing on 16.03.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH K. MEHTA)
MemberAccounts

(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 SDO 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 upto 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.

The 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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

(NARESH MEHTA)
MemberAccounts

(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

**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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)MemberAcco
unts**

(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 / 3244 / 2020
DATE OF INSTITUTION	19.10.2020
DATES OF HEARING	3.11.2020, 03.12.2020, 05.01.2021, 8.1.21, 19.01.2021, 02.02.2021, 12.02.2021 & 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. R.P. Uniyal and others, R/o Park Floors-2, Flat No. T-13/G004, Sector-76, Faridabad regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn. ,DHBVN, Greater Faridabad.
 SDO (OP) BadrolaS/Divn., DHBVN, Faridabad.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Representative.

For the Respondent: Respondent SDO

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 an 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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)MemberAcco
unts**

(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& 2.3.2021

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 an 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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)**Member Acco
unts

(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 / 3413 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	01.02.2021
DATES OF HEARING	12.02.2021&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. Sharwan Kumar, H.No.222, Gali No.1, Surya Vihar Part-2, Near Shiv Mandir, Gyassi Kothi, Faridabad regarding replacement of damaged/banded pole.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

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

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Not present.

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO.

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Sharwan Kumar, H.No.222, Gali No.1, Surya Vihar Part-2, Near Shiv Mandir, Gyassi Kothi, Faridabad has been a consumer of DHBVN under SDO (OP) Sub Divn., DHBVN, Tilpat and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that a pole near his residence is in abandoned condition and may fall any time resulting in mishap. Photograph of site was placed on record. 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 12.02.2021 at Faridabad for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 12.02.2021 at Faridabad. Both complainant and respondent SDO were not present. Forum viewed seriously negligence on the part of complainant and respondent SDO. Forum directed complainant and respondent SDO to ensure their presence on next date of hearing and respondent SDO to submit detailed report after site verification well before next date of hearing.

Proceedings were held on 02.03.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant was not present but representative of respondent SDO was present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide no. 6693 dated 2.3.2021 stating that complaint, as received, was sent to JE Incharge for visiting site and pole would be set right within seven days. Reply of respondent SDO was not satisfactory thus, forum viewed seriously the casual approval of respondent SDO towards consumer grievances. Forum directed respondent SDO to ensure his presence on next date of hearing and submit detailed report after site verification well before next date of hearing. Now to come on next date of hearing on 16.03.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)MemberAccounts**

(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 / 3427 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	10.02.2021
DATES OF HEARING	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 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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)Member Acco
unts**

(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

**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-1S/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.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)MemberAcco
unts**

(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 / 3442 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	15.02.2021
DATES OF HEARING	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. Babu Lal C/o Siyaram H.no. E-638, S.G.M. Nagar, 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. Babu Lal C/o Siyaram H.no. E-638, S.G.M. Nagar, NIT, Faridabad has been a consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 7333930000 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 during April, 2019, meter was replaced and new meter installed inside his premises without box/seal. Since then, bills are being issued without reading on average basis. 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. 683 dated 1.3.2021 stating that MCO document had been uploaded on tool by his office but still pending at CBO level. Once the MCO is updated in the system, bill will be corrected as per actual reading. Complainant was not satisfied. Respondent SDO was directed to first re-locate the complainant meter outside the premises within seven days and get the MCO updated from actual date of replacement i.e. April, 2019 and get the rectified bill delivered to the complainant within fifteen days. Now to come on next date of hearing on 02.04.2021.

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)**MemberAccounts

(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 / 3266 / 2020
DATE OF INSTITUTION	03.11.2020
DATES OF HEARING	03.12.2020, 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. Naresh Kumar C/o M/s Krishna Rice Mill, Old G.T. Road, Opp. Tyagi Mandir, Hodel Distt. Palwal regarding wrong billing.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Hodel.
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Hodel.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant: Representative.

For the Respondent: Representative of respondent SDO

INTERIM ORDER

Sh. Naresh Kumar C/o M/s Krishna Rice Mill, Old G.T. Road, Opp. Tyagi Mandir, Hodal Distt. Palwal has been consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. 2726901000 under SDO (OP) Sub Divn., DHBVN, Hodal and therefore, the Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that he has an industrial connection with CD 415 kVA. The bill issued on dated 30.05.2020 for the period 1.3.2020 to 1.05.2020 (62 days) includes MDI penalty for Rs.316242/-, which was wrong since MDI shown in this bill was 435 kVA only and within limit. As per Nigam instructions, penalty is levied in case MDI exceeds over 5% of sanctioned CD. As such, reading of MDI meter was within permissible limit, hence, MDI penalty was not chargeable. Further, MDI penalty should not be levied for not more than one month, in case chargeable. 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 proceedings were held on 03.12.2020 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO did not submit reply and requested for another date for detailed reply. Request allowed.

The proceedings were held on 05.01.2021 at Faridabad. Complainant representative and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO submitted reply vide memo.no. 1944 dated 31.12.2020 stating therein that his office has made the adjustment of Rs.316242/- plus Rs.28814/- interest thereon for the period 7/2020 to 12/2020 vide sundry no. 158/R-45 and sent to CBO for approval. Forum directed respondent SDO to pursue with CBO for approval of adjustment.

The proceedings were held on 02.02.2021 at Faridabad. None of complainant and respondent SDO was present. Respondent SDO telephonically requested for another date to submit detailed reply. Request allowed.

The proceedings were held on 02.03.2021 at Faridabad. Representative of both complainant and respondent SDO were present. Respondent SDO replied vide no. nil dated 2.3.2021 stating that adjustment of (-) Rs.166633/- has been made and reflected in the bill issued during 2/2021, copy placed on record. Reply of respondent SDO was not satisfactory. Forum directed respondent SDO to appear personally along with detailed reply during next date of hearing. Now to come on next date of hearing on 16.03.2021

(MANOJ YADAV)
Member Technical

**(NARESH K.
MEHTA)**Member
Accounts

(SANJEEV CHOPRA)
Chairperson