

**C A No. Applied For**  
**Complaint No. 232/2022**

**In the matter of:**

Rachana Verma .....Complainant

**VERSUS**

BSES Yamuna Power Limited .....Respondent

**Quorum:**

1. Mr. P.K. Singh, Chairman
2. Mr. Nishat Ahmed Alvi, Member (CRM)
3. Mr. P.K. Agrawal, Member (Legal)
4. Mr. S.R. Khan, Member (Technical)
5. Mr. H.S. Sohal, Member

**Appearance:**

1. Mohd Afsar, A.R. of the complainant
2. Ms. Ritu Gupta, Mr. Imran Siddiqi, Ms. Seema Rawat, Ms. Shweta Chaudhary & Ms. Divya Sharma, On behalf of BYPL

**ORDER**

Date of Hearing: 31<sup>st</sup> March, 2023  
Date of Order: 10<sup>th</sup> April, 2023

**Order Pronounced By:- Mr. P.K. Singh, Chairman**

1. This complaint has been filed by Ms. Rachana Verma against BYPL-LNR.
2. The brief facts of the case giving rise to this grievance are that complainant Ms. Rachana Verma is residing at property no. J-3/109, J extension, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi-110091. It is also her complaint that she

Attested True Copy  
  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

 by 1 of 4

Complaint No. 232/2022

applied for new electricity connection vide request no. 8005954511 but respondent rejected his application for new connection on the pretext of outstanding dues of other premises.

3. OP in its reply briefly stated that the complainant applied for new electricity connection at her premises no. J-3/109, J-extension, Laxmi Nagar, Delhi-110092. On receipt of application for new connection site was visited and on site visit it was found that beneficiary energy dues existed in respect of CA No. 100921280, 100921219 and 151821205 in name of Zabir Ahmed.

The site of the complainant was re-visited on 14.11.2022 and on revisit the site plan with sequence number of all the portions of property bearing no. J-3109, J-extension was prepared. The portion wherein complainant wants electricity connection as sequence no. 0335 and the outstanding dues as claimed from complainant are in respect of electricity bills having sequence no. 0335. Thus the outstanding dues claimed pertains to premises of the complainant and hence duly payable by the complainant.

4. Arguments of both the parties are heard.
5. Representative of the complainant denied the allegations of OP and submitted that only one meter was installed in the premises of the complainant and he was regularly paying the electricity bills of the said meter. He also asked to meter changing report from OP, but OP failed to provide the same. It is also his submission that his premise is of 25 gaj only, how two meters can feed such a small premise. Respondent is not providing any details regarding installation or removal of said meter from my premises.

Attested True Copy  
  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. 232/2022

6. LR of the OP submitted that at the time of meter changing from old to new, inadvertently the old meter was also left at site of the complainant and as per record available with OP the old meter is giving incremental readings therefore, the meter was in use and the bill is payable by the complainant.
7. Heard both the parties and perused the record. From the perusal of evidence placed on record pleadings and after hearing both the parties it is transpired that when the complainant applied for new electricity connection then only respondent asked him to clear the dues, why these dues were not asked from the complainant earlier. The complainant is in possession and occupation of the present property since March 2012 through registered sale deed and was enjoying electricity since then. As per complainant's submission during Covid-19, she was not able to clear the dues and her supply was disconnected. Thereafter, upon application of new connection in 2022, OP raised her the bill of unbilled meter for Rs. 6,90,363/- which was later on reduced to Rs. 69,363/- without any reason and rhyme. OP contented that the meter of the complainant was changed and during changing of meter the old meter also remained at site. Both the meters were installed at the premise of the complainant and were giving incremental readings, therefore, the complainant is liable to pay the bill of Rs. 69,363/-.
8. In view of above, we are of considered opinion that OP has been negligent on their part of removing the old meter from the site of the complainant while replacing the old meter with the new one. Further, if there was objection from the complainant for removal of old meter, what legal action OP has taken against the complainant. The complainant is owner of 40 sq yards only, and as per DERC Regulations 2017 10(1)(vi)

Attested True Copy  
  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)

      
3 of 4

Complaint No. 232/2022

only one connection is allowed in a dwelling unit, then how two meters can feed one premises. OP failed to provide the details of the meter where it was feeding electricity, thus, the complainant should not be pressed to pay the dues and OP should release the new electricity connection to the complainant without asking the complainant for pending dues of Rs. 69,363/-.


ORDER


Complaint is allowed. Respondent is directed to release the connection to the complainant without asking for payment of pending dues of Rs. 69,363/- in name of Zabir Ahmed and completion of all the commercial formalities as per DERC Regulations 2017.

OP is further directed to file compliance report within 21 days from the date of this order.


The case is disposed off as above.


No order as to the cost. Both the parties should be informed accordingly. Proceedings closed.

  
(P.K. SINGH)  
CHAIRMAN

  
(S.R. KHAN)  
MEMBER-TECH

  
(P.K. AGRAWAL)  
MEMBER-LEGAL

  
(NISHAT AHMAD ALVI)  
MEMBER-CRM

  
(H.S. SOHAL)  
MEMBER

Attested True Copy  
  
Secretary  
CGRF (BYPL)