



CA No. 100639970  
Complaint No. 66/2020

In the matter of:

C.B. Malhotra .....Complainant

**VERSUS**

BSES Yamuna Power Limited .....Respondent

Quorum:

1. Mr. Arun P Singh (Chairman)
2. Mrs. Vinay Singh, Member (Legal)
3. Dr. Harshali Kaur, Member (CRM)

Appearance:

1. None present on behalf of the complainant
2. Mr. Imran Siddiqui, On behalf of BYPL

ORDER

Date of Hearing: 05<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Date of Order: 11<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Order Pronounced by:- Mrs. Vinay Singh, Member (Legal)

Briefly stated facts of the case are that the complainant received excess bills for the month of August 2020.

The complainant submitted the connection having CA No. 100639970 is installed at UG-S-4-OG, S-4/22, Padma Tower-II, Rajendra Place, New Delhi-110008. In the month of August 2020 he received an exorbitant high bill. Therefore, he requested the Forum to direct the respondent company for revision of bill.

*Harshali*

*Imran*

*Arun*

Complaint No. 66/2020

Notice was issued to both the parties to appear before the Forum on 02.11.2020.

The respondent submitted their reply stating therein that CA No. 100639970 energized on 04.10.1999 in the name of C.B. Malhotra at U.G.S-4, OG S-4/22, Padma Tower, Rajendra Place, Delhi-110008. The said connection is of Non-domestic tariff category and having sanctioned load of 6 KVA. It is also their submission that the disputed bills against CA No. 100639970 were raised on actual downloaded reading but due to low power factor of 0.882 and also the MDI of 8 KW, fixed charges were calculated on higher side as per the procedure.

It is also their submission that the complainant should install the shunt capacitor bank so that the power factor may be maintained and will eventually affect the billing amount.

Respondent also submitted that regarding CA NO. 100645471, bills were raised on downloaded reading but due to low power factor of 0.467 bills were raised two times. In this case also complainant is suggested to install shunt capacitor bank to maintain power factor.

The matter was heard on 02.11.2020, when both the parties were present and respondent was directed to check the meter as per DERC Guidelines.

The complainant submitted his rejoinder refuting therein the contentions of the respondent and submitted that he had paid all the bills till date and the bill amounts were almost twice/thrice the normal amount when electricity was actually being used in usual business hours in pre-Covid 19 pandemic. The bill amount for the month of February 2020 was Rs. 9590/- and bills for the month of June 2020, July 2020, August 2020, September 2020 and October 2020 were of Rs. 20780/-, Rs. 12720/-, Rs. 27530/-, Rs. 20400/- and Rs. 38860/-, when electricity is in scanty use with limited staff.

*Handwritten signatures and text:*  
Handwritten signature: *Handwritten signature*  
Handwritten signature: *Handwritten signature*  
Handwritten signature: *Handwritten signature*  
2 of 4

Complaint No. 66/2020

The matter was again heard on 02.12.2020, when the respondent submitted meter testing report showing meter accuracy as +1.56%, which is within limit as per DERC Guidelines No. F(47) Engg/DERC/2007-08/2082-2084.

On 11.12.2020, the respondent filed calibration report/certificate and respondent is directed for third party meter testing as per DERC guidelines regarding DERC Public Awareness Bulletin-7. It was also directed that at the time of meter checking the complainant should also be present. Respondent will check the meter in KVAH and KWAH. Complainant got the shunt capacitor installed. Both the parties were directed to try for amicable resolution.

As per the orders of the Forum the respondent got the meter of the complainant tested through third party lab and also submitted its report by Orjaa in which meter accuracy was found within limits. The respondent was directed to get the meter tested from third party lab as per Public Awareness Bulletin-7 and DERC notification no. F.17(47)/Engg./DERC/2007-08/2082-2084. Third party meter testing was done and meter accuracy found to be within limits.

The matter was finally heard on 05.01.2020, when none was present on behalf of the complainant. Third party meter testing of the meter was done and report was submitted. The respondent was directed to revise the bill of the complainant and also waive off LPSC amount. Matter was reserved for orders.

The main issue in the present complaint is whether the bill raised by the respondent is correct or not.

We have gone through the submissions made by both the parties. From the narration of facts and material placed before us we observe as under:-

*Handwritten signatures and text:*  
*Flawless*  
*km*  
*ton*  
 3 of 4

Complaint No. 66/2020


The complainant has approached the Forum for exorbitant bills received by him during the period of lockdown and he approached the Forum for correction of his bill. As per directions of the Forum the meter of the complainant was checked by the respondent but the complainant was not satisfied with the meter testing report. Thereafter, the Forum directed the respondent for third party meter testing as per bulletin no.7, of Delhi Regulatory Commission. Point 5 In all cases of meter testing by CPRI, the test results of CPRI shall be taken as final and binding on both the parties i.e., the consumer as well as the DISCOM. That the respondent had got the third party meter testing done on the directions of the Forum and also bear the cost of third party meter testing and revise the electricity bill of the complainant and the revised bill amount for CA No. 100639970 is Rs. 9500/- and for CA No. 100645471 is for Rs. 3070/-.

Accordingly, the Forum directs as under:

1. The revised bill is correct and payable by the complainant.
2. The respondent is directed to waive off the cost of two meters changed by them as per the directions of the Forum.

The case is disposed off as above.

  
(HARSHALI KAUR)  
MEMBER (CRM)

  
(VINAY SINGH)  
MEMBER (LAW)

  
(ARUN P SINGH)  
CHAIRMAN