

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 479/2011

Date of Institution:10.01.2011

Date of Decision :24.02.2011

In the matter of

**Sh. Brij Bhan S/o Sh. Chajju Ram, Village, Malra Sarai, P.O. Lawan, Distt, Mohindergarh.**

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh , Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Brij Bhan S/o Sh.Chajju Ram, resident of village Malra Sarai, P.O. Lawan, District Mohindergarh, regarding low voltage problem at his tube well connection and shifting of T/F at another site.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing, held on 20.01.2011, the SDO submitted the reply stated therein that it is a fact that there is low voltage problem at his tube well, but the allegation of the petitioner that the T/F of higher capacity which got allocated from the higher authorities had been shifted at an another site is wrong. After hearing the SDO, the SDO was directed to get the verified record of allocation of another T/F of higher capacity from the XEN office and the report be compliance on the next date of hearing which was fixed for 24.02.2011. On the other side, the petitioner was also directed to submit the documentary proof of the allocation made for higher capacity of T/F and the same be put up on the next date of hearing.

To-day the JE was present but the petitioner was not present. The JE of the Sub-division submitted his reply vide memo No. 247 dated 22.02.2011 stated therein that as per service register record, the AP connection was released by erecting LT line from existing 100 KVA T/F, SOP to Sh. Ganeshi Lal of the same village. The consumer case file is not traceable. No T/F has been allocated from the higher office. The allegation made by the petitioner is not true. Moreover, the petitioner is a defaulter amounting to Rs.13888/- till date.

After hearing the JE, the Nodal Officer was directed to make an arrangement for augmentation of the existing T/F which is feeding the tube well connection, as the petitioner is facing low voltage problem due to which his tube well motor is not running, at an early date, so that the low voltage problem is solved. In the mean time, if the petitioner

is made the payment of the defaulting amount then the service cable of the petitioner be got replaced as the existing cable is very old and is going to be worn out, so that the petitioner could get some more voltage. Since, the petitioner failed to produce any documentary proof in support of his claim and is a defaulter, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 480/2011**

**Date of institution : 18.1.2011**

**Date of decision : 9.3.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh.Mool Chand Saini, 75/16, Mahabir Colony, Hisar.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

**ORDER**

A petition was filed from Sh.Mool Chand Saini, resident of House No.75/16, Mahabir Colony, Hisar against billing problem and refund of meter cost etc.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the SDO/Nodal Officer for his view point reply.

During the proceeding held on 14.2.2011, the SDO had submitted the reply of the petition stated therein that the amount of Rs 5522/- was charged against LL-I No.227/38 dated 22.9.2007, The said amount was charged as the petitioner had used the DS supply into the NDS purpose as such the same is not refundable. Regarding application dated 15.7.2005, the SDO had stated that his office started functioning in 2008, as such, there is no record available in his office for the above application. The SDO had further stated that the JE concerned Sh.Anil Kumar had intimated that the pole was erected before the installation of meter of Sh.Mool Chand and his office has no concern regarding the distribution of amount between both the consumers and the erection of pole etc. The amount of Rs 690/- deposited by the petitioner as a cost of meter had been refunded to him vide sundry item No,171/43 dated 10.2.2011.

In response to the SDO reply, the petitioner had given the copy of representation duly marked by the concerned JE and the copy of the same handed over to the SDO for his view point /reply.

Today, the SDO was present and submitted that the petitioner had not completed the usual formalities while applying the change of category of his connection i.e. from DS to NDS. The connection can not be converted into NDS directly by simply submitted the application. For this purpose, a separate file has to be furnished with a new A&A form along with the other necessary documents and fee. The petitioner used the NDS load about two years against his DS connection and the Nigam had detected the unauthorized used of NDS load after two years and the petitioner had been charged only for six months

as per standing instructions of the Nigam. Moreover, the cost of meter deposited by the petitioner had already been credited to his account and the same shall be reflected in his next bill.

After hearing both the parties, this Forum ordered the SDO to review the pattern of charges /penalties. and the petitioner be charged on the basis of his consumption of units for the periods . The petitioner was satisfied with the decision taken by the Forum. The Nodal Officer was directed to ensure that the refund of difference of penalty amount charged to the petitioner is refunded according to the units consumed by the petitioner during the period of charged.

The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand/

Filer be consigned to record.

**(V.P..Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 481/2011  
Date of Institution:01.02.2011  
Date of Decision :24.02.2011

In the matter of  
Sh. Avtar Singh Dogra, A-505, Sujjan Vihar, Sector-43, Gurgaon.

V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh , Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Avtar Singh Dogra, A-505, Sujjan Vihar, Sector-43, Gurgaon regarding billing problem and charging of meter rent.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted the reply vide memo No. 88dated 17.02.2011, stated therein that the defective meter of the petitioner was replaced on 12.08.2010. As per the Nigam's instructions, the consumer account is required to be overhauled after duration of three billing cycles. Accordingly, the reading of the new meter was taken on 11.02.2011 and the account of the petitioner has been overhauled vide sundry item No. 202/29R dated 12.02.2011. An amount of Rs.17976/- has been credited to the consumer account, which will reflect in the next billing cycle.

A credit of Rs.120/- on account of refund of meter rent which was charged from the petitioner has also been credited to his account and requested for closer of the case.

The petitioner was present and he was satisfied with the action taken by the SDO regarding his grievances. Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

( V.P.Gupta)  
Member

(J.S.Kadian)  
Member

(A.K.Tiwari)  
Chairman

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 482/2011  
Date of Institution:03.02.2011  
Date of Decision :24.03.2011

**In the matter of**  
**Miss Rama Priyadarshini Nagarajan, 578, Sector-21-C, Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh , Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Miss Rama Priyadarshini Nagarajan, 578, Sector-21-C, Faridabad, stated therein that she is a single working woman, having a single phase connection in her above rented house. The meter is shifted on the out side pole. She is receiving the bills on the higher side as compared to her load. She visited the office of SDO as well as the offices of higher authorities many times regarding correction of bills. Moreover, she has supplied the new meter in the sub-division for replacement of the existing meter, but nothing has been done.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing held on 24.02.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner were present. The petitioner stated that she had received a bill of Rs.26678/- in the month of Nov., 2009, Rs.45178/- in Jan., 2010, Rs.33727/- in Nov., 2010 and Rs.61277/- in Jan.,2011. Out of the above payments, she had made a part payment of Rs.10,000/- and requested that she is not in a position to make the full and final payment of the above said bills, being the bills are on higher side and requested to check up her premises and may got the meter installed/replaced which she had already supplied in the office of SDO.

On the other hand, the SDO was present and he was directed to visit the site of the petitioner and check up the load and get the meter installed at the earliest, as she had already deposited with the Nigam against replacement of her defective meter, so that the grievances could be redressed accordingly to the load and as per the reading of the new meter and report compliance on the next date of hearing.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted a letter vide memo No. 8460 dated 21.03.2011 stated therein that as per order of the Hon'ble Forum, the energy meter of the petitioner has been replaced vide MCO No. 87306/10-11 dated 28.01.2011, affected on 12.03.2011. The bill of the petitioner had also been overhauled and adjusted for the

month of 11/2010 to 3/2011 on the basis of previous consumption of O.K. period i.e. 7/2009 to 11/2009 ( $6656/3=2219$  units) and Rs.59344/- has been adjusted vide SC&AR No. 1143/R-153 after overhauling the account of the petitioner.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and protested against the base taken by the SDO for charging the amount on an average basis of 2219 units bi-monthly, as she stated that her consumption is very low and cannot make the payment of 2219 units as per version of the SDO.

After hearing both the parties, this forum directed the SDO to charge the amount of defective periods as per the readings of new meter which had now been installed at the premises of the petitioner after taking the reading of three cycles i.e. six months. A report in this regard be furnished by the SDO after Redressal of the grievances of the petitioner through Nodal Officer. In the mean time, the petitioner be charged only the payment of current consumption bills. The petitioner was satisfied with the decision of the Forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 483/2011**  
**Date of Institution:03.03.2011**  
**Date of decision : 27.6.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Jai Narain Saini, Qtr. No.117, Jalvayu Vihar, Sector-29, Faridabad.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. Jai Narain Saini, Qtr. No.117, Jalvayu Vihar, Sector-29, Faridabad against excess billing and non-refunding of his meter rent.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 21.04.2011, the SDO submitted the reply which was not in order and he was directed to submit the reply of the petition para-wise and to calculate the figures of the amount to be charged and refunded including the refund of meter rent on the next date of hearing, which was fixed for 19.05.2011.

During the proceedings held on 19.5.2011, the SDO submitted the detailed reply and a copy of which was hand over to the petitioner for his view point on the reply of the SDO respondent. The petitioner had raised some observations during the proceedings and the SDO was again directed to reply to the queries raised by the petitioner by the next date of hearing which was fixed for 27.6.2011.

Today, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO submitted the reply of the queries, stated therein that the defective meter was changed vide MCO No.39/157, issued on 3.11.2009 & effected on dated 2.6.2010. The MCO was entered in the ledger during 8/2010, The consumer was billed on an average basis from 2./10 to 6/10. Accordingly, the bill of the petitioner was corrected and an adjustment of Rs. 27067/- was made through sundry item No.115/R-129 in 5/2010 and further an amount of Rs. 40888/- was also adjusted by the billing agency in the billing month of 8/2010. Moreover, an amount of Rs 27666/- was also refunded while calculating the total amount charged through sundry item No. 145/R-130 during 8/2010 along with the meter rent of Rs.407/- in the current bill of 6/2011. A copy of chart submitted by the SDO, showing the consumption data, reading, amount charged and refunded to the petitioner was given to the petitioner for his study and further reply.

After going through the chart/data by the petitioner, the petitioner stated that the amount charged and refunded by the SDO of disputed period is not to his satisfaction. The petitioner further stated that he should be charged the amount on the basis of consumption shown by the old meter and not prior to change of meter consumption basis.

After hearing the petitioner as well as the reply of the SDO, this forum apprised the petitioner that the amount charged and refunded to him, is as per the consumption shown by the new meter after replacement of the defective meter and the maximum benefit has been granted . After detailed discussions, the petitioner was satisfied by the forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to precede the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 484/2011**

**Date of Institution:07.03.2011**

**Date of Decision : 11.04.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Smt. Rajiya Devi, H.No.54, Block-2, Sadar Bazar, Sirsa.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Smt. Rajiya Devi, H. No.54, Block-2, Sadar Bazar, Sirsa against billing on an average basis.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Tohana vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-484/SRS dated 11.04.2011 stating therein that the meter display of the petitioner was defective and the MCO No.25/20445 dated 1.12.2010 was issued but the meter was not replaced due to non-availability of meter. The consumer was billed on an average basis @ 240 units per month per KW. The sanctioned load of the consumer is 3 KW, hence the consumer billed for 720 units (3x240 units). The meter of the consumer was against checked by the concerned JE on the complaint of the consumer and the JE reported that the meter is working O.K., but it was necessary to change the meter being display defective. After that the account of the petitioner was overhauled and billed on MMC basis subject to consumption of new meter. But even after issued of the bill, the consumer had not deposited even a single penny. Hence, the PDCO was issued against non-payment of energy bills on 13.01.2011.

The Xen has further stated that the electricity supply of the consumer has been restored after depositing the outstanding amount of Rs.2452/- by the petitioner vide receipt No. 700571 dated 23.03.2011 and the account of the consumer has been overhauled subject to the consumption of new meter. Now the consumer has given her consent that she is fully satisfied being billed to her and now she has no grievances towards delay.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 485/2011**  
**Date of Institution:14.03.2011**  
**Date of Decision :03.05.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**M/s Mukandi Lal Radha Krishan Rice Mill, Daulatpur Road, Uklana Mandi, Distt.,**  
**Hisar – A/C No. U17/LS.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Sushil Kumar Jain partner of M/s Mukandi Lal Radha Krishan Rice Mill, Daulatpur Road, Uklana Mandi against non-refund of the amount charged by the Nigam on an average basis amounting to Rs.185255/- on account of slowness of meter by 33.3%.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 11.4.2011, the SDO was present and he had stated that after examined the load survey data of the petitioner, the refund case of the petitioner had already been furnished to the XEN office for his approval as per standing instructions of the Nigam for dealing such type of cases. But till date, no approval from XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Tohana has been received inspite of repeated requests on telephone to the Xen and it was decided to summon the concerned Xen on the next date of hearing to know his view point and accordingly, the summon was issued to the Xen.Sh.R.K.Sabarwal.

Today, the Sh. R.K.Sabarwal, XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Tohana was present and stated that the refund case of the petitioner has been done and in this regard, a letter of SDO/Op. S/Divn., DHBVN, Uklana was handed over to the petitioner. The petitioner was also present and he confirmed the work done by the SDO regarding the refund amount Rs.185430/-. An acknowledgement in this regard has also furnished by the petitioner for closer of his case from this forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(V.P..Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 486/2011

Date of Institution: 14.03.2011

Date of Decision : 27.06.2011

In the matter of

**Sh. S.K.Chaurasia, Project Manager, M/s Sunil Hi Tech. Engineers Ltd., Flat No.201, Shri Vinayak Apart, Plot No.5-C, Sector-22, Dwarka, New Delhi.**

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. S.K.Chaurasia, Project Manager, M/s Sunil Hi Tech. Engineers Ltd., Flat No.201, Shri Vinayak Apart, Plot No.5-C, Sector-22, Dwarka, New Delhi against non-refunding of his security deposited by him while taken the temporary connection from the SDO respondent amounting to Rs. 48000/- inspite of several visits/requests.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the various proceedings held, the SDO stated that the security amount cannot be refunded due to some audit objections and without removing of objection, the XEN concerned is unable to refund the security amount.

After hearing the SDO, this forum had taken a very serious view for raising new observations on every proceeding, instead of making the payment to the petitioner of his security amount. Ultimately a final date was given to the SDO and XEN to make the payment of his security to the petitioner by the next date of hearing which was fixed for 27.06.2011, failing which this forum will be constrained to recommend departmental action against the SDO and XEN for harassment to the petitioner for not refunding his security amount inspite of assurances.

To-day, the Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide memo No. Spl-2 dated 27.06.2011 stated therein that a cheque No. 049719 dated 22.06.2011 amounting to Rs.22967/- has been issued to the original applicant Sh. Surender Kumar after deducting the Nigam's dues pending against the petitioner.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
Member

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
Member

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
Chairman

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 487/2011**

**Date of Institution:21.03.2011**

**Date of Decision :27.06.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Avtar Singh Dogra, Secretary, Sajjan Vihar Welfare Maintenance Society, Plot No. GH-04, Sector-43, Gurgaon.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. Avtar Singh Dogra Secretary, Sajjan Vihar Welfare Maintenance Society, Plot No. GH-04, Sector-43, Gurgaon against charging of NDS tariff from BS and refund thereof, amounting to Rs.635756/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing held on 19.05.2011, the petitioner was not present and the XEN, KCG Division, Gurgaon was present and submitted the reply of the petition vide his memo No. 6447 dated 17.05.2011 stated therein that the connection of the petitioner was released under A/c No. BS-72 with sanction load of 180.35 KW with contract demand 200 KVA for common services. He further stated that as per Nigam Sales Manual Instruction No. 1(9-3), the load for catering the demand of common services like lifts, water supply, sewerage, club, street lighting and common area lighting etc. should be released under NDS category, but the Nigam charged the BS tariff inadvertently instead of NDS tariff. As and when this mistake came to the knowledge, this office rectified the mistake and charged the difference of tariff amounting to Rs.635756/-. Accordingly, a show cause notice was served upon to the petitioner vide XEN, KCG Division, Gurgaon memo No. 2894 dated 04.11.2010, giving him opportunity of 15 days to the complainant regarding filing of objection with regard to charging of tariff from BS to NDS, but the petitioner failed to file any objection with his office. Since, the petitioner was not present for his view point over the reply of the respondent XEN, the case was adjourned to the next date which was fixed 27.06.2011.

Today, the petitioner was present and stated that the Society was constructed by Army Welfare Housing Organization exclusively for serving and retired Army Personnel and their Widows during the year 2006. DHBVN had provided electricity to the Society. The individual flats have been provided meter directly by the DHBVN and the bills for them are being raised directly by DHBVN. However, for common services like lifts, street lights, water pumps, fire fighting equipment and stores, the electricity is supplied till bulk supply point vide A/c No. BS-72. The bill for bulk supply is cleared by the society every month based on bulk domestic supply rate.

Now all of a sudden, the society received a bill on account of charging of difference of tariff amounting to Rs.635756/-. On receipt of this bill, the society raised a memo to the DGM, KCG Division, IDC, Mehrauli vide their letter 3.2.2011 to give a copy of memo No. 4.11.2010 vide which a notice was served upon to them and raising of difference of arrears amounting to Rs.635756/- so that they could reply accordingly. Instead of submitted the copy of notice, the Nigam had raised a bill of Rs.759851/- including the arrears of Rs.635756/- for the period April, 2007 to September, 2010 as difference of tariff. To avoid disconnection, they made the payment of difference of arrears within a short period of notice. He further alleged that no authority in the chain of hierarchy had even cared even to reply our request for canceling/refunding the arrears charged on account of difference of tariff. It is not understood as to how the DHBVN Authority have decided to charge the tariff of NDS instead of bulk supply connection after a period of 5 years. No notice in this regard had ever been received by them. Being a society of Ex-serviceman/serving personnel, the charging of NDS tariff instead of bulk supply tariff will be a big financial loss to the society. Now as per ruling of HERC dated 03.09.2010, delivered on a similar case, the commission had ordered that connected load of lifts, fire fighting equipments, would henceforth be included as part of domestic use and the benefit of the same may also be provided to us.

After hearing the petitioner, the petitioner was told that the decision of HERC is applicable for those societies who had got single point bulk supply connection but this connection under dispute is of common area connection which falls under NDS category. The petitioner was further told that the difference of tariff charged by the respondent Xen is justified and as per the instructions of the Nigam, as the mistake is committed by the office, can be rectified at any stage. The relief of tariff from NDS to BS as per your demand, can not be granted as per the instructions. If you want to take any benefit in this regard, the matter be taken up with the HERC for change of tariff. The petitioner was satisfied by the Forum.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 488/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 30.03.2011**  
**Date of Decision : 19.05.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Sukhbir Singh S/o Sh. Sukhi Ram, Vill. Saidpur, Tehsil, Farukh Nagar, Distt., Gurgaon.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. J.C.Jain , Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. Sukhbir Singh S/o Sh. Sukhi Ram, Vill. Saidpur, Tehsil, Farukh Nagar, Distt., Gurgaon against wrong billing and non-replacement of his defective meter.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing held on 21.04.2011, the SDO was present and stated that the meter of the petitioner was defective. The petitioner was asked that due to non-availability of meter in the department, to supply his own meter for replacement of the defective meter. The petitioner supplied his own meter on 12.05.2010 and the same was installed on 26.07.2010 after testing the same from M&P Lab.

He further stated that due to non-entry of MCO in the ledger, the billing remained continued on an average basis, as the area In-charge Sh. Attar Singh, AFM was retired from Nigam's services. The account of the petitioner was overhauled on the basis of the consumption recorded by the new meter w.e.f. 9/2010 to 12/2010 and adjusted to Rs.410/- vide SC&AR No. 198/24-R. Now, the existing meter of the petitioner has also become defective, so the billing could not be made on the basis of units consumption till the replacement of existing defective meter. He further stated that the meter purchased by the petitioner has been become defective within the warranty period and he had asked the consumer to get his meter replaced from the shopkeeper as the meter became defective within the warranty period. Being a poor petitioner, the SDO was directed to help the petitioner in replacing the defective meter from the shopkeeper at the earliest, which has gone defective under warranty period.

To-day, the reply of the SDO has submitted by the Nodal Officer vide memo No. 1242 dated 17.05.2011 stated therein that as per the order of forum, the consumer defective meter has been got replaced with the new meter from the dealer as the meter got damaged within warranty period and in this regard the petitioner has been informed by the SDO to deposit the cost of checking fee with his sub-division so that meter could be installed accordingly at the premises of the petitioner. The new meter is in the custody of SDO. This fact has also been confirmed by the Nodal Officer on mobile with the petitioner. As and when the petitioner deposit the cost of testing fee, the SDO shall send the meter to the laboratory for it's checking and seals.

After hearing the reply as well as the statement of the Nodal Officer, this forum has directed the Nodal Officer to set right the average bills of the petitioner after installation of new meter as per the reading of new meter of three consecutive months.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to precede the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 489/2011  
Date of Institution: 8.04.2011  
Date of Decision : 03.05.2011

In the matter of  
**Sh.Dharminder S/O Sh.Gian Chand, V.&P.O.Haripur(Paluwas) District Bhiwani**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Dharmender S/o Sh. Gian Chand, r/o V.P.O.Haripur (Paluwas) District Bhiwani against the excess charging on account of average billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

Today, the SDO was present and submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-489/BWN dated 03.05.2011 stated therein that the meter of the petitioner was installed in the month of January, 2010 for SP category. The said meter was changed vide MCO No. 75/172 dated 20.06.2010 due to defective. After changing over the meter, the account of the petitioner was overhauled vide SC&AR No. 494/66 after taking the consumption of new meter from 7/2010 to 9/2010, which was  $4246/3=1415$  units per month. During the period from January, 2010 to June, 2010, the complainant deposited Rs.15466/- with the Nigam. Hence, the respondent acted as per law and there is no negligence on the part of the respondent in any manner. The account of petitioner was overhauled as per the Nigam's Sales Circular and requested for closer of the case.

After hearing the SDO, it is concluded that the version of the respondent SDO is found to be correct and keeping in view the version of the SDO, the petition of the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(V.P..Gupta)**  
Member

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
Member

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
Chairman



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 491/2011**  
**Date of Institution:03.05.2011**  
**Date of Decision :04.08.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh.Kitab Singh S/o Sh. Balwant Singh, H.No.38, New Mahabir Colony, Near Jindal Factory, Hisar.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer	

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Kitab Singh S/o Sh. Balwant Singh, H.No.38, New Mahabir Colony, Near Jindal Factory, Hisar against non-deposit of security for release of his DS connection.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 03.06.2011, the petitioner was present and stated that some of the connections already released by the Nigam to the nearby residents without depositing any development charges etc. He further alleged that they had got erected the poles for the LD system in their colony after strenuous efforts but later on some of the Nigam's officials removed their erected poles for erection of the same somewhere else. Immediately, the matter was reported to the Nigam but no action has been taken by the Nigam so far against the culprits who had removed their poles illegally. One of the poles is still erected in front of his house. He further requested that the matter be got enquired into and the necessary instructions may kindly be imparted to the Nigam's official for depositing the security for release of the DS connection, as in the hot summer season, it is not possible to live without the electricity.

After hearing the petitioner, the Nodal Officer was directed that the matter be got investigated for removing of the poles by the Nigam's officials from the area and in the mean time, the security from the petitioner be accepted and release the connection accordingly. As the connections of other residents in the area had been released by the Nigam without any depositing of development charges, why this connection cannot be released. The Nodal Officer is further directed to get the LD system laid in the area after framing the necessary estimates for connecting the

connections, which had already been released by the Nigam on the Bullies, to the pole, so as to avoid any fatal/non-fatal accident.

During the hearing held on 5.7.2011, the SDO was present and submitted the reply vide memo No. 525 dated 05.07.2011 stated therein that the applicant refused to deposit the cost of estimate amounting to Rs.10208/- for laying out the system in the area. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that why he deposit the entire cost of estimate as three number connections had already been provided by the Nigam without depositing any estimated cost. He further stated that he is a poor man and cannot afford a huge amount.

After hearing the SDO as well as the petitioner, the SDO was directed to take up the matter with the three number consumers where the Nigam had already released the connections to them, to deposit the share cost of the estimate otherwise their connections be disconnected after serving proper notices to them. If they refuse to deposit the cost of the estimate then an estimate be framed for laying down the LD system in the area and necessary estimate be got sanctioned from the competent authority for providing the connection. The Nodal Officer was directed to take up the matter with the concerned XEN for approval of the estimate and release of material thereof at the earliest and report compliance on or before on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 03.08.2011, so that the petition is disposed off accordingly.

Today, the petitioner and the SDO were present. The SDO submitted the reply stated therein that the meter of the petitioner has been accepted and the same has been sent to the lab for testing and on receipt of the same from the lab, the connection of the petitioner shall be released. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he was also satisfied with the statement of the SDO and requested for closer of the case. Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 492/2011**

**Date of institution of case: 27.9.11**

**Date of decision: 5.10.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Sanjay S/o Sh. Ramphal, Ward No.11, Narnaund.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**Order**

A petition was received from Sh. Sanjay S/o Sh. Ramphal, Ward No.11, Narnaund against non-release of his tube well connection.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 3.6.2011, the SDO as well as the Nodal Officer was present and submitted the reply vide his memo no. Spl-I dated 3.6.2011, stated therein that the demand notices to the applicants delivered who have applied up to 6/2009 as per Nigam instructions. 140 number applications for release of tube well connections were come-up during this period. Tenders of these connections have been completed by the Construction Wing vide bid No. 78/SE/Const./HSR/2010-2011. The work is under progress and will be completed within 90 days from the date of issue of bid. The connection of the petitioner shall be released within one month.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present stated that he had a tube well connection in the name of his father but due to some circumstances, the connection was got disconnected. The tube well line is still existed with two number of poles and conductor. Now he had applied for a new connection in his name and the Nigam is not releasing his tube well connection, though he is a senior most applicant on that line. It is requested that necessary directions may kindly be imparted to the concerned SDO to get his connection released from the old line at the earliest as he had suffered a huge loss due to non-release of his tube well connection by the Nigam. The SDO was asked as to why this connection cannot be released on the old line. The SDO stated that as per the prevailing instructions, the connection can be released on 11KV line.

During the hearing held on 05.07.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide memo No,

Spl.2 dated 4.7.2011, stated therein that the applicant applied for tube well connection on dated 18.5.2009 vide applicant no.48296. The demand notices to the applicants have been delivered who have applied for the connections up to 6/09 as per Nigam instructions. 140 nos applications of connections were come-up during this period and his seniority no.125. Tender of these connections have been floated by Construction Wing vide Bid No.78/SE/Cnst.HSR/2010-11. The work is still under progress & will be completed very soon as per supervisor of the Firm. The connection of the above petitioner will be released as per the seniority. The old line has also been dismantled.

The SDO was asked as to why he had promised during the last proceedings that the connection of the petitioner shall be released by the end of June-2011. The SDO stated that as per the promised made by the contractor's supervisor, he had given the statement on the basis of assurance given by the contractor's man. It is requested that the matter may kindly be taken up with the Xen .Construction that had floated the tender to the contractor for the release of the connection o the petitioner. The Nodal Officer was present he was of the opinion that the summon be sent to the Xen,. Constructions, DHBVN, Hisar who will intimate the correct position of release of the connections. The Forum decided to call the Xen. Construction to appear before the Forum on the next date of hearing through Summon.

During the hearing held on 04.08.2011, the Nodal Officer and the concerned Xen. Construction was present. The Xen Construction, DHBVN, Hisar has submitted a memo No. Spl-1 dated 04.08.2011 stating therein that the work of supply of material, testing and commissioning of 11KV line with Pole mounting Sub Station for release of 140 Nos. tube well connection under Op. Sub Division, Narnaund on turnkey basis vide bid No. 78/SE/Const./HSR/2010-11 was allotted by the SE/Const. Circle, DHBVN, Hisar to the firm M/s Super Power & Communication, Booth No. 50, New Grain Market, Hisar on dated 20.04.2011.

The entire work was required to be completed by the above firm up to 29.05.2011. But the firm has completed only 80% of erection work of 11KV line and not supplied the T/Fs. and other materials, inspite of so many notices/reminders and the higher authorities has already been apprised of the situation. It has been learnt that the matter is being initiated for black listing the firm, who had taken the work. After hearing the SDO, the XEN(Const.)& SDO concerned, Hisar has been advised to take up the matter with the contractor as well as with the Nigam for release of the tube well connection of the petitioner at the earliest. The progress of the same be intimated by the SDO concerned on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 06.09.2011

During the proceedings held on 9.9.2011, the SDO was present and stated that the work of releasing of tube well connection of Narnaund area will take place by the contractor by the next 15-20 days for which the matter has already been taken up with the contractor to complete the work as per the agreement. He further stated that the estimate of the petitioner has been made defective as the estimate for release of the tube well connection at site for two number poles whereas as per the actual calculation of length of line, the estimate for three number poles was required to be made. For this purpose, the cost of another pole is Rs.7000/- is required to be deposited by the petitioner before releasing the tube well connection by the contractor.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the charge of the SDO that the estimate of the petitioner has been made wrongly in the first instance is wrong as the site is of the same where the calculation had already made for the length of line and the cost of estimate had already been deposited by him. He further stated that the length of line be got again calculated.

After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was asked as to why the wrong estimate was framed in the first instance. The matter should be checked up and if it is required then the cost be got deposited from the petitioner, otherwise the connection be released against the cost deposited by the petitioner of the estimate already sanctioned by the Nigam. The SDO was further directed that the connection of the petitioner should be released within the minimum time as the matter has already been over-delayed, so that the petitioner could crop his field in time.

Today, the petitioner and as well as the representative of the SDO/OP. was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide his memo No.Ch.20/Forum-492/HSR dated 6.10.2011, stated therein that for the release of tubewell connection, the poles and conductor has been erected as per estimate and connection will be released immediately when the T/F from the contractor will be installed on the site. The consumers also satisfied and he will give an affidavit after release of his connection. On the other hand, the petitioner was present that during the last hearing, the SDO had promised that his tube well connection shall be released by the 5<sup>th</sup> of October-2011 but till date ,only poles and conductor has been erected. He is suffering of huge loss due to non release of his tube well connection.

After hearing the petitioner and reply of the Nodal Officer, the Nodal Officer was asked to why the connection of the petitioner is not released inspite of assurance given by the Xen.Consturction,DHBVN,Hisar during the last hearing date. The Nodal Officer then called the SDO Construction and the contractor

under whom the tube well connection work is going on. The SDO Construction stated that due to non availability of the transformers, the work of release of tube well connection is held up. Now the transformers are being received and the as per the seniority, the connection of the petitioner shall be released as the petitioner seniority no. is 125 and the seniority in release of the tube well connection can not be violated/ignored. He further stated that a minimum time of 25 days will take place in release of the tube connection of the petitioner, as an average of 5 no transformers can only be installed in a day.

This Forum is of the view that the release of the tube well connection of the petitioner shall take a minimum one month's time, the matter can not be kept pending for more time, as the matter has already over delayed in Redressal of the complaint Accordingly, Nodal Officer would take up the matter with the concerned Xen/SDO Const. till the connection is released as per assurance given by the SDO Construction, before the Forum, and the compliance be reported on or before the next date of hearing which is fixed for 8.11.2011. The case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from the Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**R.V.Bari**  
**Member**

**K.K.Gupta**  
**Member**

**A.K.Tiwari**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 493/2011**

**Date of Institution:12.05.2011**

**Date of Decision :21.07.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Devi Singh S/o Sh. Bhedi Lal, V&P.O. Baroli, Distt. Palwal.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Representative

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Devi Singh, V&P.O. Baroli, Distt., Palwal against average billing and disconnection of his connection.

Accordingly the petition of the petitioner is sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 19.5.2011, the SDO was present and submitted the reply through Nodal Officer, stated therein, that a notice was served upon to the consumer by his office in reference to the on-line complaint made by the consumer on 13.01.2011. But the consumer not attended his office till date and an amount of Rs.56461/- is outstanding up to the reading of 12037 recorded by Meter Reader. Due to non-payment of defaulting amount, the PDCO was issued on 05.04.2011 and affected on 07.04.2011. But, un-luckily, in the billing cycle of March, 2011, the old reading wrongly written by the computer as 286 in place of 12037 units. Hence bill of the consumer made by the computer for reading of 12068 wrongly. As it is difference of new and old reading recorded by the computer which is clearly wrong. The wrong billing has been set-right vide SC&AR No. 434/191/R-109 for Rs.57958/-. Now the net payable amount after correction of the bill is Rs.56436/-

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and protested against the reply of the SDO. The petitioner further stated that the Meter Reader had not taken the reading of his meter from the date of connection and the billing is made on an average basis inspite of repeated requests to the concerned staff of the sub-division. The petitioner further alleged that the statement of the SDO is far from the truth and requested for thorough investigation. The petitioner was asked to supply the receipt of the payments of bills from the date of connection but the petitioner has shown his inability to supply the same. Accordingly, the SDO was directed to supply the data of the meter reading and payments made by the petitioner from the date of connection to date, so that final decision be taken on the petition of the petitioner. After disconnection of the connection of the petitioner, due to non-making the payment of defaulting amount, the petitioner is still getting the supply from the main line illegally and un-authorisedly for which the petitioner has been warned to avoid a case of theft of energy. The SDO has been asked to ensure that the petitioner is not getting any illegal supply from the main line. Since the

petitioner was to submit the documentary proof in support of his claim and the necessary data was required from the SDO, the case was adjourned to the next date 27.6.2011.

During the hearing held on 27.06.2011, the SDO was present and submitted the necessary documents in support of his claim i.e. copy of LL-I, made during the checking & M&P checking report vide his memo NO.898 dated 21.6.2011 . Since the petitioner attended the Forum after the departure of the concerned SDO in late hours, the proceedings could not be held. The petitioner was asked to produce documents in support of his claim i.e. the bill receipts by which the payment had been made by him with the SDO but he could not produce the same due to one pretext or the other. He was advised to bring the documents in support of his claim on the next date of hearing which was fixed on 21.07.2011, but the petitioner was not present.

On the other hand, the SDO was present and he was asked about the petitioner visit to his office for his claim but the SDO stated that the petitioner is in the habit not to make the payment of his electricity bill. The bill served upon to the petitioner was as per the rules. The petitioner had not visited to his office not even a single time to meet the SDO for his Redressal of grievances. After hearing the SDO, the contention of the SDO is found in order.

Since, the petitioner failed to produce any documentary proof in support of his claim, nor he present himself before the forum, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 494/2011  
Date of institution : 19.5.2011  
Date of decision : 27.6.2011

In the matter of  
**Sh. Vishal Bajaj S/o Sh. Ashok Bajaj, 108, CA DLF-II, Central Arcade, Gurgaon.**  
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh , Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Vishal Bajaj, r/o 108,CA,DLF-II, Central Arcade, Gurgaon regarding refund of average amount charged on account of defective meter.

Accordingly the petition was of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply.

During the proceedings held today, the petitioner was not present but the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition, stated therein that the meter of the subject cited consumer was defective which was replaced on 1.12.2010. Now the account of the consumer has been overhauled, based on reading of 22.6.2011. An amount of Rs 64519/- has been credited to consumer's account vide sundry item no.311/30R and the Nodal Officer requested for closer of the case.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
Member

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
Member

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
Chairman

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 495/2011**

**Date of institution :19.5.2011**

**Date of decision : 27.6.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Satish Kumar Madan, H.No.2319, Sector-49, Faridabad.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Satish Kumar Madan , resident of H.No.2319,sectopr 49,Faridabad regarding excess amount charged on account of average billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his view point/reply.

During the hearing held today, the petitioner was not present but the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No.8978 dated 27.6.2011, stated therein that the bill of the petitioner has been set right after reading verification and a sum of Rs 15923/- has been credited to the consumer's account vide SC&AR No.255/R-142 and requested for closer of the case.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to precede the case further; hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 496/2011**  
**Date of Institution:26.05.2011**  
**Date of Decision :21.07.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Smt. Nazma Begum W/o Late Sh. Sheokand Ali, H.No.48, Deepawali Colony, Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Representative

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Smt.Nazma Begam w/o late Sh.Shaukat Ali, resident of House No.48, Deepawali Colony, Faridabad regarding excess billing.

Accordingly , the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his view point /reply.

During the proceedings held on 27.06.2011, the petitioner was not present but the Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the petition vide memo No.993 dated 24.6.2011, stated therein that the reading of the petitioner's meter was taken by Sh.Bir Singh,MR from October 2009 to 3/2011 Now the reading has been taken for the month of 5/2011 at 2000 kwh. Accordingly, the reading bill of consumer is corrected vide SC&AR No.IR-64. This office also contacted to the petitioner on mobile but he stated that he is not able to attend the office, being hospitalized.

To-day, the petitioner was not present but the representative of the SDO was present and he stated that the grievances of the petitioner has been redressed and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the grievances of the petitioner has been redressed, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 497/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 02.06.2011**  
**Date of Decision : 21.07.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Gokul Singh S/o Sh. Himat Singh, V&P.O. Bassai, Tehsil & Distt., Mohindergarh.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present in person.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Representative

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Gokul Singh S/o Sh. Himat Singh, V&P.O. Bassai, Tehsil & Distt., Mohindergarh regarding illegal shifting the T/F from his tube well site.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 27.06.2011, the SDO and the petitioner was present. SDO submitted the reply vide his memo No. 1560 dated 22.06.2011 stated therein that the connection of the petitioner is fed from 100KVA T/F SOP to Sh. Dalip Singh. The voltage checked on 21.06.2011 and found OK in the presence of Sh. Anang Pal S/o Sh. Gokul Singh and the voltage as under:

RY =424 V  
YB =425 V  
RB =423 V

As far as shifting is concerned, it was done with the direction of the Nigam with sanctioned estimate No. MC-1790/2009-10 and SJO No. 85/268 dated 28.12.2009, issued in the name of Sh. Deep Chand, SSA, and the then area In-charge. On the other hand, the petitioner stated that after shifting of the T/F, he is not getting proper voltage due to which his motors had been burnt and requested for back shifting of the T/F at his tube well. The SDO has further stated that low problem has been occurred at the tube well of the petitioner due to which one no. defaulting consumer before the tube well of the petitioner is stealing the energy by running motors unauthorizedly by taking the supply direct from the main line passing in front of his tube well during the season. Now a days, there is no voltage problem and the voltage at the tube well is O.K.

After hearing of the SDO, the SDO was directed to take remedial measure and to ensure proper voltage at the tube well of the petitioner by giving the supply to the petitioner through other source instead of present T/F. The SDO promised that he will look into the matter at personal level and shall submit the report of giving the proper supply to the petitioner from other source. The SDO was further directed to disconnect the line from where the un-authorized person is getting supply from the T/F being fed to the petitioner.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO stated that he is in touch with the grievances of the petitioner and is taking remedial measures. In this work, it will take a

time. In this work, one or two poles are required to be erected from other side to give the supply to the petitioner properly. In this work, if the petitioner is ready to deposit the cost of the poles, then the supply to the petitioner can be connected from other source where a proper voltage is available. This forum asked the petitioner, if he is ready to deposit the cost of one or two poles then he can be given the proper voltage to his tube well from other source and he was ready to deposit the cost of the poles. The SDO was directed to frame a deposit estimate and the same be brought in the knowledge of petitioner so as to deposit the same by the petitioner. After receipt of the payment from the petitioner, the work be started immediately.

Since, it will take a time to redress the grievance of the petitioner; there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**



**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 499/2011**  
**Date of Institution:08.06.2011**  
**Date of Decision :27.06.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Smt. Phool Wanti Devi W/o Sh. Sudama Singh, H.No.10, Gali No.1, Ravi Colony, Near Shiv Mandir, Sehtpur, Faridabad.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Representative

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Smt. Phool Wanti Devi W/o Sh. Sudama Singh, H.No.10, Gali No.1, Ravi Colony, Near Shiv Mandir, Sehtpur, Faridabad against excess billing over the reading.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the representative of the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No. 994 dated 24.06.2011 stated therein that the bill of the petitioner has been corrected vide SC&AR No. 43/R-64 and copy of corrected bill has also been handed over to the petitioner. On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present and stated that he is fully satisfied with the correction of bill and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 500/2011**  
**Date of Institution:20.06.2011**  
**Date of Decision :04.08.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Darshan S/o Late Sh. Chhotu Ram, Ward No.11, V&P.O. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Darshan S/o Late Sh. Chhotu Ra,m, Ward ,No.11, V&P.O. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 5.7.2011, The had SDO stated that he could not prepare the reply of the petition due to non-receipt of the petition in time from the Nodal Officer and requested for adjournment of the case.

Today, the SDO and the petitioner were present. The SDO submitted the reply of the petition ,stated therein that the bill of the petitioner has been rectified and the petitioner is satisfied. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he also given in writing that his grievances has been redressed by the SDO and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta )**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 501/2011**

**Date of Institution:20.06.2011**

**Date of Decision : 27.06.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Rambir Singh S/o Sh. Ram Sarup, M/s VARK Cooperative Society, Plot No. GH-14, Sector-21D, Faridabad.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Rambir Singh S/o Sh. Ram Sarup, M/s VARK Cooperative Society, Plot No. GH-14, Sector-21D, Faridabad regarding excess charging.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO as well as petitioner was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the petition, stated therein that the connection of the petitioner was checked by vigilance on 19.02.2010 vide LL-1 No. 14/2816 and found the consumer by using 22.040 KW against the sanctioned load of 11 KW. Moreover, the red phase and neutral of meter was found direct due to block burnt. The amount charged for using un-authorized use of electricity amounting to Rs.178696/- subject to overhaul the account of the consumer on the basis of new meter consumption. The penalty was debited to the account of the petitioner vide SC&AR No. 299/R-137. The consumption base of consumer after replacement of energy meter from 7/10 to 12/10 comes out to 15766 units. Moreover, the consumer has not submitted the test report of his connected load after checking.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the initial consumption was not on higher side as per the consumption shown by the new meter and requested for waiving off penalty amount.

After hearing the petitioner, the petitioner was told by the forum that this is a case of un-authorized use of electricity and this forum cannot give any relief. The amount charged by the SDO is as per the Nigam's instructions and as per rules. The contention of the SDO is found in order. The forum convinced the petitioner regarding the contention of the SDO and the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 502/2011**

**Date of Institution:20.06.2011**

**Date of Decision :21.07.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Rambir Singh S/o Sh. Ram Sarup, M/s Sunil Singh Panwar, Plot No. GH-39, Sector-1, IMT, Manesar, Gurgaon.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Representative

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Rambir Singh S/o Sh. Ram Sarup, M/s Sunil Singh Panwar, Plot No. GH-39, Sector-1, IMT, Manesar, Gurgaon regarding charging of average amount on account of defective meter.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 27.06.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO stated that he could not prepare the reply of the petition due to non-receipt of the petition from the Nodal Officer. The case was adjourned to 21.07.2011.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO stated that the meter of the petitioner remained burnt from 5/2010 to 6/2010 and accordingly the new meter was replaced vide MCO No. 89/43 dated 18.06.2010. On the basis of the consumption of new meter, the bill of the petitioner was overhauled to the tune of Rs.128057/- On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the average be charged on the basis of the consumption prior to the burning of meter. The petitioner was apprized that this is not possible and as per the instructions of the Nigam, the petitioner be charged on the basis of the consumption which ever is on higher side.

Since, the contention of the SDO is found in order; there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 503/2011**

**Date of Institution:23.06.2011**

**Date of Decision : 25.08.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Dr. J.K.Sama, President, Sterling Apartments Residents Welfare Association, Charmwood Village, Suraj Kund, Faridabad.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh.J.C.Jain, Nodal Officer.

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Dr. J.K.Sama, President, Sterling Apartments Residents Welfare Association, Charmwood Village, Suraj Kund, Faridabad regarding wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing held on 27.06.2011, the representative of the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The representative of the SDO stated that due to non-receipt of the petition from the Nodal Officer, the reply could not be prepared by the SDO and requested for next date. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the Meter Reader as well as the staff of the Sub-Division are harassing the consumers/residents of the apartments by making wrong billing and correction thereof and requested for thorough checking of their meters along with readings installed in their apartments and take action accordingly. Since, the SDO was not present along with the reply; the case was adjourned to the next date i.e. 21.07.2011. The representative of the SDO was directed to convey the feelings of the Forum to his SDO & to come fully prepared along with the reply of the petition on the next date.

During the next date of hearing, the petitioner was present but Sh.Jitender Dhull, SDO OP.S/divn.Mathura Road,Faridabad nor his any representative was present before the Forum. Since Sh.Ram Mehar Singh,Nodal Officer was not present, his representative Sh. Nirmal Grover, Stenographer repeatedly requested the SDO on phone to report before the Forum along with the reply of the petition as the Forum is waiting for him for dispose-off the petition. After a long wait, Sh.Tek Chand, CA of the sub-division was reached at about 12.45(noon). The Nodal Officer was not present , the Forum asked the CA to show the reply of the petition ,which was sent by the Nodal Officer to the SDO for more than a month back so that the same could be discussed in the presence of the petitioner. He stated that no reply has been prepared by the SDO and he is not able to explain/reply of the petition.

On the other hand, the petitioner along with other complainants were present and they stated that they are attending the Forum for Redressal of their grievances but this show that the SDO is not keen to redressed their grievances as is evident from the reply of the representative of the SDO. The petitioner further stated that their grievances are genuine which are required to be

thoroughly investigated. The petitioner along with other complainants, who were present, have alleged that the meter reading taken by the Meter Reader in their apartments are not matching with the bills as they have also maintained a Meter reading register for their reference and record. Due to which, the Nigam are issuing wrong bills on higher side by exceeding the meter reading against their actual consumptions which is a matter of investigation.

The CA of the sub-division stated that there is some problem in taking the meter reading in some of the premises where reading is not visible to the Meter Reader due to darkness of the room where meters are installed and he requested that the consumer be advised to shift their meters outside the premises so that meter reading problem could be sorted out. The petitioners along with the other complainants are requested to shift their meter outside the premises and they agreed for the same.

The acts on the part of the SDO for not appearing before the forum along with the reply of the petition were viewed very seriously. Nor the SDO got the area surveyed for which a petition is pending, which is a clear cut disobedience of the instructions. A penalty of Rs.300/- was imposed upon the SDO for not appearing before the forum along with the reply even after repeated telephone calls by the representative of the Nodal Officer to the SDO, well before the date of hearing and on hearing day. The CAO/Pay & Accounts, DHBVN, Hisar was requested to deduct the penalty amount from the salary of the concerned SDO and report compliance through the Nodal Officer. The compliance has not been received from Nodal Officer till date. The Nodal Officer is directed to take up the matter with the CAO/P&A, DHBVN, Hisar and confirm this forum whether the penalty amount deducted or not.

The representative of the SDO was directed to inform his SDO about the feelings of the forum and the grievances of the petitioner be redressed by the next date of hearing which was fixed for 25.08.2011 and report compliance.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO submitted the compliance report through Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Spl-1 dated 24.08.2011. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he also given in writing that most of the grievances have been settled and remaining grievances shall be sorted out by the SDO as per the instructions of the Nigam, very shortly.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 504/2011  
Date of Institution: 24.06.2011  
Date of Decision :05.07.2011

In the matter of  
**Sh. Raghu Bishnoi, V.&P.O. Jandwala Bishnoian, Tehsil, Mandi Dabwali,  
Distt., Sirsa.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. Raghu Bishnoi, V.&P.O. Jandwala Bishnoian, Tehsil, Mandi Dabwali, Distt., Sirsa against running of fast meter, wrong billing and re-connection of his connection.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. SDO submitted his reply stated therein that after receipt of the complaint from the petitioner, the meter of the petitioner was got checked from M&P Lab. The M&P submitted his report that the working of the meter is O.K. It seems that this is a case of clubbing of meter reading as per the view of this Forum. Regarding the re-connection of his connection, the petitioner is a defaulter, amounting to Rs.22974/-, and the connection was disconnected vide PDCO No. 60/306. The SDO was directed that the connection of the petitioner be re-connected on receipt of the defaulting amount from the petitioner. The contention of the SDO is found in order; hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta )**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 365/2009**  
**Date of Institution:16.06.2009**  
**Date of decision : 4.8.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Hari Ram S/o Sh. Rameshwar, C/o Rajiv Kiryana Store, D.C. Colony, Bhiwani.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Ram Mehar Singh, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Sh. Hari Ram S/o Sh. Rameshwar, C/o Rajiv Kiryana Store, D.C.Colony, Bhiwani against the shifting of overhead line passing over the Mandir & the houses.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the various proceedings held in this case and after going through the reply of the Nodal Officer, this forum had passed the order during the proceedings held on 07.09.2009, stated therein that electricity rules of 1956 of section 79, 80 & 82 are very clear that if the SDO had released the electricity connection under the already existed overhead line and causing apparent danger with hazardous installation, he is accomplish to the crime. When SDO knew that the distance between the overhead line and the houses underneath is less than the required vertical clearance, he should have not release the connection.

Instead of complying the order of this forum dated 07.09.2009, the SDO respondent challenged the order of the forum and filed an appeal by the respondent SDO with the approval of L.R., HVPN, Panchkula before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and Hon'ble High Court receipt the case vide Diary No. 476389 dated 26.02.2010 and the Nodal Officer requested before the Forum that since the matter being sub-judice before the Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court, the case may kindly be adjourned sine die till the decision of the Civil Revision No. 2733 of 2010.

Accordingly, after going through the contents of the letter of Nodal Officer as well as the documents submitted by the respondent SDO with regard to filing of case by the SDO against the order of this forum, this forum had passed the order on dated 04.12.2009, and adjourned the case sine die till the order is passed by the Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh. The Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court fixed the case for hearing on dated 27.07.2010. During the further proceedings held, the Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court vide order dated 01.06.2011, directed this Forum to proceed further

with the pending complaint of Sh. Hari Ram & decide the same finally in accordance to law.

Accordingly, this case is listed for dated 05.07.2011 by giving the direction to Nodal Officer to appear before this forum on dated 05.07.2011 along with the respondent SDO.

During the proceedings held on 5.7.2011, the Nodal Officer as well as the SDO respondent was present. The Nodal Officer stated that the petitioner had already given an affidavit for withdrawal of the case. The Nodal Officer was directed to show the affidavit. The Nodal Officer showed the copy of affidavit. After seen the copy of the affidavit, it was found that the affidavit was written and signed by the petitioner a more than one year back. The Nodal Officer was directed to produce a fresh affidavit from the petitioner, if he is ready to withdrawn the case from the Hon'ble court on or before the next date of hearing which is fixed for 03.08.2011, so that the case is decided much before the next date of hearing of the case in the Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court which is fixed for 17.08.2011. The Nodal Officer/SDO was further directed to take action as per the order already passed by this forum during the proceedings held on 07.09.2009 to shift the overhead line passing over the Mandir and the houses at the cost of the Nigam, or to settle the issue by taking the matter with the petitioner at their level to sort out the grievances of the petitioner and report compliance on or before the next date of hearing of the case..

Since, the electricity rules of 1956 of section 79, 80 & 82 are very clear that if the SDO has released the electricity connection under the already existed overhead line and causing apparent danger with hazardous installation, he is accomplish to the crime. When SDO knew that the distance between the overhead line and the houses underneath is less than the required vertical clearance, he should have not release the connection. The lives of the residents are very valuable. The Telegraph Act 1861 does not allow the authority to construct the overhead line, over the residential plots and the houses without their consent and without making payments to owners of land, of the area to use for the right of way. No such payments have been made to the residents and the Nigam cannot have the dictatorial attitude of laying overhead lines over the residential area.

Today, the SDO, S/U Sub /Division .No .II, DHBVN, Bhiwani was present and he submitted a fresh affidavit duly signed from the petitioner through the Nodal Officer, stated therein by the petitioner in the affidavit that he does not want to get the order complied with already passed by the FRCG, DHBVN, Hisar on dated 7.9.2009, against shifting of over head line passing over the Mandir and the houses of colony, from the respondent SDO and wanted to withdraw the case from the Forum.

Since the petitioner has given in writing through an affidavit dated 26.7.2011 that he does not want to get the order of FRCG complied with for shifting of overhead lines passing, for the reasons best known to him and requested for withdrawal of the case from

the Forum. Keeping in view the request from the petitioner, there is no idea to proceed the case further; hence the case is closed from this Forum. The Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court may be informed accordingly, as desired.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File is consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 505/2011**  
**Date of institution : 5.7.2011**  
**Date of decision : 22.9.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Sushil Kumar S/o Sh.Shish Ram Ram,V & P.O., Karawara Manakpur,Teh.& District Rewari..**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Sushil Kumar S/o Sh.Shish Ram, V& P.O.Karawara Manakpur,District Rewari against non connecting of service line in the Dhani with the village Transformer.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the hearing held on 21.07.2011, the JE In charge of sub office Palhawas was present. He submitted the reply of the petition, stated therein, that Sh. Sushil Kumar has a domestic connection, bearing a/c No. AA11-3131 in village Karawara Manakpur in the field area out of village Lal Dora/Firni. The connection is approximate 335 meters for away from village line T/F. There is no any village supply line nearby the house of the petitioner. The consumer given an application to change the supply module from AP line to DS line. The site was visited by Sh.Birender Singh JE/F and found that there is no any domestic line nearby the connection. As per instructions, a deposit estimate, costing Rs 218250/-, was prepared to connect the same and sent to AGM City S/Divn.No.I,Rewari vide this office memo No.1611 dt 7.7.2011 for sanction. After hearing the JE Incharge Sub Office Palawas, it was observed that the SDO and the JE have no knowledge of the Nigam Sales instructions/ circulars, issued from to time. The reply of the JE Incharge sub office Pahlwas as well as the reply of Nodal Officer,DHBVN,Hisar is not found in order. The Forum has provided a copy of Sales Instructions No.D-21/2011 dt 10..6.2011, in which, it is clearly stated that please refer to the Sales Instructions No.10/2010 dt 20.8.2010,23/2010 and 26.10,2010 vide which the decision to connect the cluster of houses (Dhanis)with DHBVN with population of 11 or more persons to the rural domestic feeders and sharing of expenditure of approx.Rs 44.96 crore on 50:50 basis between the State Govt. and consumers.

Keeping in view of above, Nigam has decided to connect the cluster of houses (Dhanis)with population 11 or more persons to the rural domestic feeders and sharing of the expenditure on 50:50 between Nigam and the consumers. The cost of the T/F shall not be taken from consumer even if the Nigam installs a separate 25KVA T/F. The Nigam Management has further reviewed and decided to amend the existing instructions which are mentioned in the above

Sales Instructions No.D-21/2011. A copy of the same was provided to the Incharge sub Office and he was directed to go through the contents of the Sales Instructions No.D-21/2011 with terms and conditions mentioned in the above sales instructions and he was asked to go through the contents of the latest Sales instructions, then action be taken accordingly while framing the estimate for cluster of houses(Dhanis)with population 11 or more persons. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he was asked that as per the latest instructions, 50:50 share cost is required to be deposited by the petitioner. The petitioner was also provided a copy of the Sales Instructions & he was ready to deposit the 50:50 share estimated cost.

During the proceedings held on 25.8.2011, the Senior Feeder Manager, Sub-office, Palhawas was present and submitted a copy of reply vide memo No. 1730 dated 17.08.2011 through the Nodal Officer stated therein that as per the instructions of the Nigam as well as the direction from the forum, the revised estimate has been submitted to the petitioner amounting to Rs.64386/- to deposit wit the Nigam so that the work could be started accordingly. Till date, no response has been received from the petitioner. This forum directed the JE Sub-office to issue a reminder to the petitioner to deposit the cost of estimate so that the work could be start accordingly and report compliance on the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 22.09.2011.

During the Senior Feeder Manager was present but the petitioner was not present. The Senior Feeder Manager submitted the that as per the direction of Hon'ble Forum, this office had issued again reminder to the petitioner to deposit the estimated cost of the works to be done but the petitioner is not coming forward to deposit of the estimate.

Keeping in view the reply and the statement of the Senior Feeder Manager and also absence of the petitioner, this Forum directed that as and when the petitioner come forward to deposit the estimated cost of the work, his work shall be started immediately. Since the direction has been passed to the Senior Feeder Manager and the delay on the part of the petitioner for not deposit the amount of estimate, there is no idea to precede the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 506/2011**

**Date of Institution: 15.07.2011**

**Date of Decision : 25.08.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Naveen Kumar Kohli, M/s Vatika Limited, Vatike Triangle Sushant Lok-A, Mehrauli Road, Gurgaon.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. J.C.Jain, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Naveen Kumar Kohli, M/s Vatika Limited, Vatika Triangle Sushant Lok-A, Mehrauli Road, Gurgaon, bearing account No.FC-01ND33-0012 with sanctioned load of 7641KV with CD 4374KVA on 19.6.2008 under Domestic Bulk Supply, against refund of Rs 3497151/-. The petitioner further stated in his petition that the Nigam without affording any opportunity of being heard to them, suddenly converted the category of supply from Bulk Domestic Supply to NDS without verifying the facts and raised a demand of Rs 2133720/- & 1816465/-, illegally and unlawful, alleging therein that during checking of premises of petitioner on 25.6.2010, it was found that the load of common facility is more than 15% of connected load. It was further alleged that the petitioner was liable to pay 409 paisa per unit on the basis of Bulk Non Domestic Supply of tariff instead of Bulk Domestic Supply of tariff @ 350 Paisa per unit, without disclosing the period for which the calculation was made.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day i.e. 25.8.2011, the petitioner was present and stated that the Nigam had raised demand for Rs 2133720/- on 3497151/- on dated 27.09.2010 based on a survey carried out on 25.6.2010. They have charged the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic. The other Association filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders

dated 3.9.2010 held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission order on domestic tariff. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum set up by the Licensee.

That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.6.2010 was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power( mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, the representative of the respondent Xen of the area was present and submitted that during the special checking conducted by the office, and on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load and as per the half margin, Rs 2133720/- & 1816465/- was charged prior to the period 03.09.2010.

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the respondent XEN had charged the amount as per the Nigam's instructions and according to the increased load. The same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner. The petitioner was fully convinced. After convincing the petitioner, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**( V.P.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 507/2011**  
**Date of Institution:04.08.2011**  
**Date of Decision :09.09.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Kailash Chand Goel, 126/10, Garhi Mohalla, Hansi, Distt., Hisar.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Kailash Chand Goel, 126/10, Garhi Mohalla, Hansi stating therein that a complaint was lodged for restoration of supply at his 3-phase meter installed at the premises of the petitioner. While attending the complaint, the meter was got burnt along with cover of meter and the Nigam charged the cost of meter and thereafter restored the supply. He further stated that the meter got burnt due to negligency of line staff and the cost of meter should not be charged from him. .

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the representative of the SDO as well as the petitioner's counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, advocate was present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply vide memo No. Ch-4/Forum-507/HSR dated 09.09.2011, stated therein that the site was inspected by the SDO in the presence of complainant on 01.09.2011 and found that the supply is running now in 3-phase with the held of 4-core 16mm square cable and electro mechanical burnt meter is installed at site. During inspection, it has been observed that this fault might be in the house circuitry and there is no any protective device/MCB (3-phase) installed in mains before energy meter and cause short circuited two phase meter standard block grave with meter terminal cover, resulting into, it was not imagine fault in circuitry as supply was running single phase but two no. phased removed due to sparking/carbonized from pole which were fresh prepared by peeling cable and re-connecting and fault occurred in meter terminal due to already short circuited in meter terminal block burnt cover. He further stated that there is no any fault of any officer of the Nigam and it was the fault in wiring of consumer due to non-providing of auto trip MCB. The consumer was requested to arrange new 3-phase Electronic Whole current

meter as meters are not available in the Nigam store. The meter was of electro mechanical and about 30 years old which was also completed its tentative life.

On the other hand, the petitioner counsel was present and protested against the reply submitted by the Nodal Officer. He alleged that the meter was sparked at site while rectifying the supply of his client. No report was prepared at site nor any report was given to his client, after checking the meter by the Line Staff. He further alleged that while checking the fault of supply, the supply should have been cut off before the meter. The meter was working O.K. and the billing was made to him prior to burning of meter was as per the reading of meter reading. He further stated that the Nigam is not solving the instructions of HERC for checking the accuracy of meter of consumers at every five years of durations so the meter should be got replaced at the cost of the Nigam as the meter was working O.K. before sparking of meter.

After hearing the petitioner counsel, as well as going through the reply of the Nodal Officer, this forum decided that the cost of meter should not be charged from the petitioner as the meter has been burnt due to negligency of line staff, so the meter be arranged by the Nigam. The Nodal Officer was asked to get the meter replaced at the earliest and the account of the petitioner be overhauled after taken the reading of three consecutive months. The counsel of petitioner was satisfied with the decision of the forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 508/2011**  
**Date of Institution:04.08.2011**  
**Date of Decision :09.09.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Mohinder Kumar C/o Jai Bhawani Engg. Works, Railway Road, Near Sabzi Mandi, Charkhi Dadri, Bhiwani.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer	

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Mohinder Kumar C/o Jai Bhawani Engg. Works, Railway Road, Near Sabzi Mandi, Charkhi Dadri, Bhiwani.stating therein that he is having an NDS connection, bearing A/C No. 32-CT-31-0046 which has been installed at his shop. During the year 2009, the Meter Reader shown the meter status report as faulty and the bills were raised on an average basis. He had made several requests to the DHBVN to check the meter accuracy and action be taken accordingly. On 22.02.2010, he made another request to the SDO to check the meter. The SDO got checked the meter of the petitioner and the meter was found O.K. Thereafter, he made the request to the SDO to overhaul his account and the necessary refund be made but the SDO has not made any refund up to June, 2011.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted the reply through Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar vide memo No. Ch-4/Forum-508/BWN dated 09.09.2011 stating therein that the bill of the consumer has already been corrected with the approval of XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Ch.Dadri vide SC&AR No. 61/107R dated 16.05.2011 for Rs.13502/- and this amount has been credited in the consumer account. He further stated that the difference of surcharge which was not adjusted in the above sundry item, the same now has been adjusted vide another sundry item No. 86/107R dated 01.09.2011 for Rs.3467/-.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the contention of the SDO that the surcharge of Rs.3467/- out of Rs.8394/- has been adjusted is not on the basis of fact as the whole amount of surcharge Rs.8394/- which was

required to be adjusted/waived off but the SDO has waived/adjusted only Rs.3467/-, which may kindly be got adjusted.

After hearing the petitioner, this forum decided that the whole amount of surcharge i.e. Rs.8394/-, which was wrongly charged by the SDO, be adjusted/waived off. This was conveyed to the Nodal Officer and the Nodal Officer agreed for the same.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K. Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 509/2011**

**Date of Institution:09.08.2011**

**Date of Decision: 21.11.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Yogesh Chhabra S/o Sh. Lajpat Rai, Gonda Ram Chowk, Nuh, Distt., Mewat.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Yogesh Chhabra S/o Sh. Lajpat Rai, Gonda Ram Chowk, Nuh, Distt., Mewat against harassment by making average amount for his no fault.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 25.8.2011, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition vide memo No. 1462 dated 23.08.2011 stated therein that the petitioner is a domestic consumer bearing A/C No. ND-440(ND-11-1232F) in the name of Sh. Sunder Dass, R/o Gonda Ram Chowk, Nuh. On dated 11.01.2011 at about 5.50 PM Sh. Tasleem JE and Sh. Rashid JE along with Technical staff made a raid at the premises of above mentioned consumer. During inspection, it was found that meter body was damaged and both M&P seals were tempered. As the meter was out side the home/premises they requested the consumer to check the connected load inside the premises, but the consumer did not allow them. The raiding party prepared the checking report and submitted in this officer on 11.01.2011 and recommended that the meter be sent to M&P lab for its checking along with the consumer. Also a notice of theft was made to the consumer amounting to Rs.28995/- provisionally vide this office memo No. 187 dated 14.01.2011 and the consumer deposited the same. Consumer also filed a petition in Lok Adalat on 25.01.2011 to dispose off his application. The Lok Adalat issue order that before filing the appeal to this Lok Adalat, the consumer first should go to the appropriate court/forum for dispose off his application.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present on the date of hearing and stated that he had already requested to the SDO for checking of the meter being dead stop which was situated out side the premises. A team of 10-12 persons visited the premises of the petitioner, where his old age mother was there and she refused to allow them into her house, being an old and alone lady to check the connected load of the premises. Later on, they manipulated at their own and get the penalty notice issued to him for which they amount of penalty had been deposited by him under protest to avoid disconnection.

After hearing both the parties, it was decided that the SDO should send the meter to the M&P lab in the presence of the petitioner and report be sought. The petitioner was also directed to cooperate with the SDO and should accompany with the representative of the SDO to the M&P lab for its accuracy.

During the proceedings held on 22.9.2011, the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. On that day, the SDO submitted that as per the direction of the Forum, the petitioner was contacted to come to the M&P Lab for checking of the meter in his presence, but the petitioner stated that he will not go to the lab for checking of his meter in his presence. After hearing the SDO respondent, this Forum ordered to the SDO that petitioner be contacted again and if he refuse to come forward to check his meter in the lab, then a team of two persons be accompanied to check the meter from the lab and on the basis of report of checking, the action be taken accordingly. The report be submitted to this Forum on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 20.10.2011.

During the proceedings held on 20.10.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner was not present. The Nodal Officer was asked to submit the compliance report of the last proceedings held on 22.9.2011 but the Nodal Officer stated that he had contacted the concerned SDO on mobile, but the SDO concerned had shown his inability to report before the Forum without any valid reason. If he was busy in other assignment, then the compliance report should have been sent /submitted before the Forum through any representative of his office, but he failed to comply with the instructions/order. Accordingly, a fine of Rs 300/- was imposed upon the SDO for not submission of the information on Standard of Performance and defying the order of the Forum.

The Nodal Officer was directed to ensure the submission of the compliance of the order of the proceedings held on 22.09.2011 on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 21.11.2011, failing which ex-party proceedings shall be held.

To-day, the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. He submitted that as per the order of the forum, the meter got tested from M&P lab without the presence of the petitioner as the petitioner was given the final date vide his memo No. 2027 dated 17.11.2011 to accompany on 19.11.2011 in the lab for checking the accuracy of his meter. The M&P laboratory has given the accuracy report of the meter, mentioning therein that the meter body as well as the M&T seals are found tempered. Keeping in view the report of the M&P, this is a case of theft of energy and this forum cannot adjudicate the case of the petitioner. The action of the SDO is found in order as per the Nigam's instructions. The case of the petitioner is hereby rejected being a theft of energy case.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 510/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 30.8.2011**  
**Date of Decision : 22.09.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Yogesh Kumar Garg, Flat No.106,HEWO Apartment,GH-42,Sector 56, Gurgaon. A/c No.BS-93.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Yogesh Kumar Garg, resident of flat No.106,HEWO Apartment, Owner Welfare Association, Gurgaon regarding refund of arrears charged on account of change of category of load of bulk supply connection ( from DS bulk supply to NDS bulk supply) ,amounting to Rs.1004304/-.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply..

To-day the petitioner was present and stated that the DGM,KCG Division, Gurgaon raised a demand for Rs 1004304/ vide is memo No.2886 dated 4.11.2010 based on a survey carried out , as arrear due to difference in tariff between BS domestic and BS non domestic supply. They have deposited amount of the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with the Nigam. He further stated that some other similarly affected Residents Welfare Associations filed a petition against the DHBVN demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010, held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission's order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, set up by the Licensee. That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.10.2006, was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power( mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk

supply, all these services would have been at the cost of DHBVN. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

On the other hand, Sh.Manoj Yadav, Xen was not present but his representative was present and he submitted the reply of the petition of the petitioner vide his office memo No.10441 dated 20.9.2011 ,stating therein that during the special checking conducted by the team of the Nigam & on the basis of load of common area found at site, the audit party pointed that the BS NDS tariff is chargeable as per Nigam instructions as the common load was found more than the 15% of prescribed load, and as per the Audit half margin, Rs 1004304/- was charged to the HEWO Apartments Owner Welfare association. Accordingly, the SDO had charged the amount as per the direction of audit party & as per Nigam's instructions. Their office had charged the difference of tariff after detection of load of common area and nothing else had been charged except the above.

Now as per Sales Circular No.15/2010, the connected load of fire fighting equipment, Lifts and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010,,and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the latest Commission's order .

After hearing both the parties, & also going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the SDO had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner, so there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File is consigned to record.

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 511/2011**  
**Date of Institution:01.09.2011**  
**Date of Decision : 20.10.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh.Smt.Sunita Duggal w/o Sh.Ramesh Duggal,H.No.699,Sector-14,Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present in person.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was filed by Smt. Sunita Duggal, resident of H.No.699, Sector-14, Faridabad against excess billing inspite of making regular payments of the bill.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply. During the proceedings held on 22.09.2011, SDO OP.S/divn.East, DHBVN,Old Faridabad was present and he submitted the reply of the petition through the Nodal Officer,DHBVN,Hisar vide his memo No.Spl.2 dated 22.9.2011, stated therein that the meter of the consumer was got checked from Sh.Prem Singh,JE on 21.9.2010 and found meter working blinking on load and connection was wrongly connected of H.No.699,sector-14 and H.No.761 sector-14 vise-versa/inter-change. After verifying the meter, the bill was rectified vide Sundry charged and allowance NO.117/R-130 and complaint of the consumer had been disposed-off.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and protested against the reply of the SDO respondent. She stated that the reply of the SDO is not based on facts and is incomplete, as she is making the payment of the electricity bills regularly and SDO had sent a wrong and excess bill of Rs 31750/- which is unjustified.

After hearing the petitioner, the SDO has submitted that a complaint of her neighbourer was received by him in his office against billing on higher side against his sanctioned connected load and on the basis of complaint, the site was got checked from the JE concerned of the area and found that the service cable of the petitioner was connected with the petitioner neighbourer/complainant of House no.761 of sector 14. After detecting the same, the service cable of both the consumers were rightly got connected/inter changed with their meters from the pole. On the basis of the connected load and the consumption data of both the premises, the amount of bill was got corrected and debited to their accounts. The difference of unit's consumption amount was charged to the petitioner for the months from July to September-2010, during which the service cable were inter-changed by the Lineman wrongly. The amount of units 747 and 1575 which were earlier charged from the petitioner, got transferred to the account of the

petitioner's neighbour and the earlier amount charged for the units of higher consumption of the petitioner from the neighbour, was got transferred to the account of the petitioner. And on the basis of higher consumption/data, the petitioner was charged the balance/out-standing bill of the units amounting to Rs .31750/- , after deducting the amount already paid by the petitioner. After charging the amount of balance units, the petitioner made a petition before the Hon'ble Forum against wrong billing, which was not in order.

After hearing the statement of the SDO and going through the data of consumption of the petitioner, the SDO respondent was asked to confirm whether the amount of the neighbour consumption has been deducted from the bill of the petitioner or not, which may be intimated to the petitioner as well as to the Forum on or before the next date of hearing which is fixed for 20.10.2011.

To-day the SDO was present and the petitioner was also present. SDO submitted the reply through Nodal Officer vide memo No. Spl-2 dated 20.10.2011 stated therein that a sum of Rs.10205/- has been credited to consumer account after overhauling the account of the petitioner. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the required amount has not been credited to her account. She further stated that the meter installed at her premises seems to be running fast which may please be got checked. The amount which was required to be adjusted was around Rs.11000/- but SDO has credited only Rs.10205/-. The petitioner was asked to submit an application to the SDO for checking the accuracy of the meter so that the SDO could check the meter accuracy from the M&P lab after observing all usual formalities. The SDO was directed to get the account re-checked and if any discrepancies found the same may be got rectified accordingly and as per the instructions of the Nigam. He was further directed that on receipt of an application for checking of the meter from the petitioner, the same may be acted upon after observing all usual formalities and action be taken accordingly.

The Nodal Officer is directed to get the matter taken up with the XEN concerned who will enquire into the matter of interchange of the service cable connection of the petitioner with the other neighbour of resident H.No.761 of Sector-14, Faridabad. A charge sheet may also be got framed against the delinquent official(s). The compliance be reported to this forum after taking necessary action.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(R.V.Bari)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 512/2011**

**Date of Institution:12.09.2011**

**Date of Decision : 20.12.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh.T.S.Sidhu,H.No.202,GF,Sector 16,Faridabad,a/c No.AA16/3472.**  
**V/s** **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. T.S. Sidhu, resident of house No.202, GF, Sector 16, Faridabad against not making of billing according the units consumption and the billing is being made on an average basis which is very much on higher side, inspite of repeated requests to the SDO.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his view point/reply.

During the proceedings held on 22.09.2011, the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. SDO has submitted the reply of the petition of the petitioner through the Nodal Officer,DHBVN,Hisar vide his memo No.Spl.1 dated 22.9.2011,stated therein that the connection of the consumer/petitioner was released on 15.4.2011 and from the date of connection, the consumer was billed on average basis due to non recording of reading. Now the reading was got taken as 1616 units on the verification of Sh .Ravinder Saini,JE and the same has been recorded in meter reading sheet for preparation of bills and the bill earlier raised and average be adjusted in the next billing cycle.

Since the petitioner was not present, SDO was asked to make a corrected bill and the same be delivered to the petitioner after adjustment of the amounts already paid by the petitioner of average billing and the copy of corrected bill be submitted on before the next date of hearing which was fixed for 20.10.2011,so that the petitioner could be apprised of the same on the next date of hearing.

During the proceedings held on 20.10.2011, the SDO was present and he has submitted vide his memo No. Spl-2 dated 20.10.2011 stated therein that the connection of the consumer was released on 15.04.2011 and from the date of connection, the consumer was billed on average basis due to not recording of reading. Now the reading

was got taken as 1616 and the same has been verified by Sh. Ravinder Saini, JE. The reading has been recorded in the ledger for preparation of the bills on the basis of reading and the average readings shall be got adjusted in the next billing cycle i.e. in the month of 11/2011. Since, the petitioner was not present, the SDO was directed to ensure that the correct bill of the readings has been delivered to the petitioner on or before the next date of hearing by adjusting all the averages. The Nodal Officer was also directed to get the matter taken up with the concerned XEN for taking the action against the delinquent official(s) who had not recorded/entered the readings in the ledger after release of the connection within the prescribed period and action taken report be submitted to this Forum on or before the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 21.11.2011.

To-day, the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. The SDO submitted that the bill of the petitioner has been rectified by taking the reading from the premises which was not taken by the Meter Reader Sh. Surender Singh. The petitioner had deposited the amount of rectified bill and there is no dispute of petitioner. His office had tried his level best to obtain an acknowledgement regarding settlement of dispute but the petitioner premises found locked.

As per the version of the SDO, the grievances of the petitioner has been redressed and there is no idea to proceed the case further, hence the case is closed from this forum. The SE/Op. Circle, DHBVN, Faridabad is requested to take stern action against Sh. Surender Singh, Meter Reader, who had not recorded the meter reading at the premises of the petitioner, resulting into the un-necessary harassment to the petitioner, under intimation to this forum through the Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 513/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 29.09.2011**  
**Date of Decision: 06.01.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh.Bhagwan Dass S/o Sh.Lal Chand,Vill.Lohari Ragho, Tehsil Hansi,District Hisar.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Present.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh. Nirmal Grover, Steno.	

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Bhagwan Dass S/o Sh.Lal Chand, village .Lohari Ragho, Tehsil, .Hansi, District Hisar, bearing a/c No. MT-51/160 AP, stated therein that due to fallen of Kafety (failure of tube well), his tube well is not working. He further stated that he had deposited the application for shifting of tube well connection from one site to another site and the entire amount of shifting as per estimate framed by the concerned SDO, had already been deposited by him but the Xen. OP. Division, Hansi had rejected his case, by giving the reference of Sales Circular No.D-16/2010 that the shifting is not as per the above sales circular.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceeding held on 5.10.2011 , the petitioner as well as the SDO OP.S/division, Narnaund was present. The SDO submitted the reply of the petition through the Nodal Officer, vide his office memo No.Ch.4/Forum-513 dated 5.10.2011, stated therein that the AP Tube well can not be shifted to another site. The shifting of tube well connection can only be made in the same contiguous field/same farad as per DHBVN Sales Circular No.D-16/2010. The applicant's site is not in contiguous field/same farad.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that the farad of the land where the connection is required to be shifted is in the same name. The petitioner requested that the clause of contiguous field may kindly be got relaxed so that his connection could be shifted to another site.

During the hearing held on 05.10.2011, , the Nodal Officer was directed to take up the matter with the Commercial Wing at his level and may apprise the difficulty, being faced in the field offices ,and to get the Sales Circular No.16/2010 amended , so that the grievances of the consumers could be redressed by the

field offices and the complaints of such type are minimized, as the Nigam had issued the above Sales Circular only to minimize the consumer's grievances, but in the above Sales Circular, the grievances of the consumer cannot be minimized. The progress of the same will submit by the Nodal Officer on the next date of hearing.

During the proceedings held on 08.11.2011, the petitioner as well as the SDO respondent was present. The Nodal Officer was asked to submit the compliance of the instructions passed by this forum during the hearing held on 05.10.2011. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the SDO vide his memo No. Ch-8/Forum-513/HSR dated 08.11.2011, which was not in order. The Nodal Officer further stated that he had taken the matter with the concerned SDO and XEN to get the Sales Circular amended from the Commercial Wing, but no compliance has been reported. The Nodal Officer was again asked why the matter had not been taken by him with the Commercial Wing instead of concerned SDO/XEN(OP). The matter has been viewed very seriously by this forum for not taking the matter with the Commercial Wing for getting the Sales Circular amended. The Nodal Officer has been directed to take up the matter with the Commercial Wing for getting the Sales Circular No. 16/2010 amended on or before the next date of hearing failing which this forum shall pass the order with out any further delay as the poor farmer is suffering a huge loss on account of non-shifting of his tube well connection. The petitioner had already deposited the entire cost of shifting with the Nigam as per the estimate framed by the SDO.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that he is a poor farmer and can not afford for any further new tube well connection at the site.

After the proceedings, the Nodal Officer written a letter to this forum vide his memo No. Ch-11/Forum-513/HSR dated 16.11.2011 stated therein that his office had already taken up the matter with the DGM/Op., DHBVN, Hansi with c.c. to GM/Commercial, DHBVN, Hisar vide his office memo No. Ch-8/Forum-513/HSR dated 08.11.2011 that as per para 2, sub para (u) of HERC Regulations issued vide Regulation No. HERC/02/2004 dated 12.04.2004, the Nodal Officer means the convener designated by the Distribution Licensee who would coordinate with the Forum/Ombudsman/Commission. Hence, the matter had already taken up with the concerned field officers for amending the Sales Circular No. 16/2010.

During the proceedings held on 06.12.2011, the petitioner as well as the Nodal Officer was present. The petitioner stated that he had taken up the matter with the SDO office as well as the Contractor regarding the estimated cost of the work to be done through his own cost. The Contractor stated that the expenditure to the tune of around Rupees One Lac will be incurred under self finance scheme.

He is not in a position to incur a huge expenditure. On the other hand, the Nodal Officer was asked as to whether the Nigam has amended the Sales Circular No. D-16/2010. He stated that the matter is under process and will likely to be amended within next month. The petitioner was told to wait another one month till the above circular is amended.

To-day, the petitioner as well as the SDO was present. The SDO and the petitioner was apprised by the Member of Forum that a revised circular No. D-1/2012 dated 06.01.2012 has been circulated by the Nigam, for shifting of tube well connections of Agriculture Pumping Supply, which will be received by the SDO shortly. After release of this Circular, the grievances of the petitioner shall be redressed. The SDO was advised to collect the above Sales Circular from the office of Commercial Wing and take further action as per Sales Circular and as per the Nigam's instructions .

The SDO stated that now there will be no problem in shifting and releases of the tubewell connection after issue of this Circular, as the required formalities have already been completed by the petitioner. The SDO was directed to-do the needful as per the above circular strictly and report compliance after release/shifting of tube well connection from one site to another site within the radius of 1200 feet on the same land of the owner of tube well connection.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari )**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 514/2011**

**Date of Institution:30.09.2011**

**Date of Decision : 21.11.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. A.S.Jaiswal, H.No.E-31, Sector-11, Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:  
Present on behalf of Respondent:

Present in person.  
Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. A.S.Jaiswal, R/o H.No.E-31, Sector-11, Faridabad against billing on average basis after replacement of the meter in 11/2010.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 20.10.2011, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition vide his memo No. Spl-3 dated 20.10.2011 stated therein that the meter of the consumer was changed during the month of 11/2010 and the consumer was being billed on average basis. Now, the account of the consumer was overhauled as per the reading recorded by the Meter Reader. A sum of Rs.45109/- became adjustable which will be credited in the next bill i.e. 11/2011.

On the other hand, the petitioner Sh. A.S.Jaiswal, working as XEN in DHBVN, has stated that he had tried his level best to get the bill prepared according to the reading, but his bill had not been rectified on one pretext or the other. Now, after filing of the case before the forum, his bill has been corrected by the SDO. He further requested that being a XEN in DHBVN, his bill had not been corrected by the SDO after a lapse of period of one year.

After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was directed to intimate the name of the concerned SDO, JE of the area and the CA of the Sub-Division, who had not acted as per the instructions of the Nigam and harass the petitioner without any fault, on or before the next date of hearing, so that their names could be intimated to the Administration for taking disciplinary action against them for dereliction of official duties.

To-day, Sh. Raj Kumar, CA was present and stated that he has joined the sub-division recently and could not produce the names of delinquent officials who had not acted as per the Nigam's instructions and harassed the petitioner for months together. On the other hand, the petitioner Sh. A.S.Jaiswal was present and stated that his billing

problem has been resolved by the SDO and he is satisfied with the action of the SDO. Since the lapses had been committed by the staff of the sub-division, the XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Old Faridabad is advised to enquire into the matter of lapses committed by the concerned technical/non-technical staff while affecting the MCO and further preparation of the bills. The names of delinquent officials be reported by him to the SE/Admn., DHBVN, Hisar through the SE/Op. Circle, DHBVN, Faridabad for taking disciplinary action for the lapses committed by them, as per the Nigam's instructions under intimation to this forum.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 515/2011**  
**Date of Institution:03.10.2011**  
**Date of Decision :21.02.2012**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Narender Kumar S/o Sh.Ami Lal, Tehsil, Hansi, District Hisar.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Nirmal Grover, Steno

**ORDER**

A petition of Sh Narender Kumar S/o Sh.Ami Lal, resident Qutab road, Hansi was received through his counsel Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate Hisar, stating therein that the applicant is having an electricity connection, bearing a/c No.HR-41/005 from the respondent- service provider and has been paying the bills. The photocopies of some of the bills-cum-receipt for the month of 2/2011, 4/2011, 6/2011 are attached here with. These bills show that the meter of the consumer become defective at the reading of 1193 and Nigam had issued wrong bills whereas the supply of the consumer went off at the said reading and Nigam has not restored the supply and thereafter, the respondent has restored the electricity supply of the applicant with new meter in 6/2011.

That the Nigam has illegally charged amount of Rs 41,855/- and Rs. 1,22,452/- from the applicant in 7/2011 without disclosing the reasons, giving the details of the said charged amount to the applicant, without giving any prior notice before charging and not following the due process of law. This is wrong, illegal and against the principle of natural justice

That the applicant visited the office of the respondent and pointed out the wrong charges of the said amount and the Nigam has admitted that charges are wrong and the Nigam reduced the bill for Rs 25,000/- and respondent be directed to withdraw the said amount from the account book of the consumer permanently and to issue a correct bill to the applicant. The said applicant is not liable to pay the said amount.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO respondent for his reply/view point.

During the proceedings held on 08.11.2011, the Nodal Officer submitted orally that he has checked the case/reply of the SDO and after going through the reply of the SDO and the documents related to this case, some discrepancies have been noticed. The Nodal Officer admitted that while preparing the bill of the

petitioner, some mistakes had been committed by multiplying wrong factor while preparing of the bill, due to which the wrong billing had been done to the petitioner. Now, the direction has been passed by him to the concerned SDO to rectify the bill of the petitioner on the basis of the consumption and the reading of new meter installed at the consumer premise. The Nodal Officer submitted that two days time be given to the SDO for rectification of the bill on the basis of checking report of M&P and the consumption. After hearing the Nodal Officer, the request was granted and 2 days time allowed to furnish the correct bill to the petitioner, so that the case could be closed accordingly.

During the proceedings held on 06.12.2011, the counsel of the petitioner and representative of SDO were present. The Nodal Officer submitted the reply of the respondent SDO vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-515/HSR dated 17.11.2011, stating therein that the said energy meter became defective pertaining to display the consumption reading at 1195 and not 1193. It is more clear from the energy bill of 2/11,4/11,5/11 & 6/11, where old reading has been recorded/shown as 1195. Further it is made clear that the above meter was not showing the reading on the display screen but the energy/electricity was passing through the LT CT, so question does not arise to go off supply. The consumer was using electricity in his factory for the purpose and he accordingly deposited the fixed charges bills in his office without raising any objection pertaining to non availability of electricity in his premises. Had the said consumer made correspondence with the SDO or higher authorities regarding non availability of electricity? The version of the consumer regarding non availability of supply in his premises is totally baseless, un-lawful and denied.

The Audit Party of DHBVN had audited the account of the petitioner during 3/11 & 6/11 and after auditing the record, half margin paras have been raised regarding fixed charges and meter dead stop as per reading report. The required notices for charging an amount of Rs.1,22,452/- had been served upon to the petitioner vide memo No. 5177 dated 14.3.2001 and 6053 dated 13.06.2011, which were received by the petitioner. It was made clear to the petitioner that if he had any objection then he can lodge the objection before the office within 10 days but no objection had ever been made by the petitioner.

Regarding charging of Rs.41855/-, it was verified and observed that the above amount was wrongly charged by applying Multiplying Factor 20 instead of MF-1. Now the account of the petitioner pertaining to Rs.41855/- has been overhauled and the net amount Rs.64327/- has been refunded.

The allegation of petitioner is wrong, baseless and hence denied. The petitioner came to his (SDO) office on 29.07.2011 to deposit the energy bill and requested for part payment with reason that he had only Rs.25000/-. The remaining amount shall be deposited during the next month along with the next bill.

The copy of reply of SDO was handed over to the counsel of petitioner for his ready reference and further view point on the next date of hearing.

The counsel of petitioner stated that the reply given by the SDO is far from truth as no Nigam Instructions/HERC Instructions have been followed by the Nigam while preparing the bill. He further stated that no bill has ever been delivered to his client. The reading shown by the SDO of the defective meter as 1195 units on the display screen, whereas the Nigam has recorded the reading in the ledger as 1262 units. This is clearly contradictory statement/reply of the SDO. Moreover, the half margin made by the audit party is not based on facts. No notice of SDO regarding charging the amount by audit party had ever been delivered. The signed receipt of above notice, affixed on the notice are bogus, the date shown by the SDO in the notice is 24.03.2011 and the bogus signature affixed is of dated 07.09.2011. As per citizen charter of Nigam/HERC, the defective meter should have been replaced within 7 days, but this method has not been followed by the SDO. The amount as refunded by the SDO is with out surcharge. The surcharge already charged by the SDO should have also been refunded but the surcharge has not been deducted. He further alleged that his client had been billed twice by the SDO. The counsel of the petitioner requested that his client may be given the correct bill and as per the reading, after deducting the surcharge as levied by the SDO, while preparing of the bill.

On the other hand, the SDO was present. He stated that the action taken by his office is as per the report of M&P and the charges pointed out by audit party.

After hearing both the parties, this Forum had observed that the documents supplied by the SDO with the reply are seemed to be incorrect. The SDO had been directed to correct the bill on the basis of the reading by taking the base of reading of new meter. The amount charged by the audit party should be got reviewed and supply the correct bill to the petitioner within 7 days. The compliance of above order be reported on the next date of hearing.

During the proceedings held on 06.01.2012, the SDO as well as the counsel of the petitioner were present. Sh.Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer who was required to be present on behalf of the respondent SDO but not present for the reasons best known to him. Nor any other officer was present on behalf of Nodal Officer, for presenting the case before the Forum on dated 06.01.2012. His steno Sh. Nirmal Grover, submitted a memo No. Ch-10/Forum-515/HSR dated 03.01.2012, duly signed by the Nodal Officer, which was not in order as per the direction given during the last hearing date by the Forum. The SDO was asked to explain as to what amount has been calculated to be charged from the petitioner and submission of documentary proof of M&P Lab vide which the meter of the petitioner had been declared as burnt/damage, but he failed to produce the same, nor he could not explain before the Forum properly.

On the other hand, the counsel of the petitioner stated that the SDO is misleading the Forum for not submission of the proper reply even after lapse of one month's time, nor he rectified the amount to be charged from his client.

After hearing the SDO respondent & counsel of the petitioner, the matter had been viewed very seriously for violation of the instructions of the Forum, Sh.Nirmal Grover,Steno who was present, directed to convey the feelings of the Forum to the Nodal Officer and to submit the proper reply along with the documentary proof on the next date of hearing, failing which this Forum will pass the order on the basis of available documents.

To-day, the CA of the sub-division was present and he furnished a detailed reply, which was handed over to the petitioner counsel for his study and further submissions, if any. During the proceedings, the counsel of the petitioner was apprised that the amount so charged during the meter defective period has been adjusted by taking the base of consumption of corresponding months. After all adjustments, an amount of Rs.1,47,592/- is outstanding up to date and the petitioner is not depositing the same. The necessary directions may kindly be given to the petitioner to deposit the Nigam dues at the earliest.

The counsel of the petitioner was present and stated that he is not satisfied with the amount charged and adjusted by the SDO.

After going through the reply of the petitioner, this Forum has concluded that the SDO while charging and adjusting the amount of the petitioner for the defective period, has acted as per the Nigam instructions and the contention of the SDO is found in order. More-over, the credit/refund of excess billing due to application of wrong multiplying factor has also been given and the adjustments on account of excess units charged to the consumer have also been carried out. The version of the petitioner counsel that he is not satisfied with the action taken by the SDO, is not genuine and hence, the case of the petitioner is hereby closed. The SDO has rightly charged the amount and there is no scope to give any further relief to the petitioner.

Since, the cause of action is over, the case is not to be proceed further and closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 516/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 03.10.2011**  
**Date of Decision : 20.12.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**M/s ANN Exports Pvt. Ltd., Plot No.293, Udyog Vihar, Phase-VI, Gurgaon.**  
**V/s** **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from M/s ANN Exports Pvt. Ltd., Plot No.293, Udyog Vihar, Phase-VI, Gurgaon against wrongly charging Rs.14,45,815/- along with interest and penalty for already settled case under sur-charge waiver court case scheme under Sales Circular No. D-2/2009 and after compromise arrived between M/s ANN Exports Pvt. Ltd. and the Nigam in Chandigarh High Court. It is contempt of court. He requested for removal of arrears from the bills.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 20.10.2011, the XEN was not present but his LDC, Sh. Mukesh Kumar was present and submitted a letter through the Nodal Officer vide memo No.300 dated 19.10.2011 stated therein that due to engagement in other important court case in Civil Court, Gurgaon, this office cannot submit the reply on this date. He requested to allow next date for submission of reply.

On the other hand, the Nodal Officer was asked as to why the reply has not been prepared and submitted by the XEN, KCG Division, Gurgaon inspite of the petition already sent to his office by Nodal Officer on 07.10.2011. The matter has been viewed very seriously by the forum. The Nodal Officer was directed to take up the matter with SE/Op. Circle, DHBVN, Gurgaon for not furnishing the reply by the XEN, KCG Division on or before the date of hearing. The Nodal Officer was directed to ensure the submission of the reply by the next date of hearing which is fixed for 21.11.2011.

During the proceedings held on 21.11.2011, the petitioner as well as the XEN was present. The XEN, KCG Division submitted the reply vide his memo No. 564 dated 21.11.2011 stating therein that the then SDO, Kadipur wrote a letter to the complainant vide his memo No. 1149 dated 26.02.2009 mentioning therein that his court case has been settled as per guidelines of Sales Circular No. D-2/2009 and surcharge amount have been waived off and principal amount paid. After that internal Audit party raised a half margin No. 146 dated 20.08.2009 and requested the SDO to put up the record to audit, otherwise recharge the amount to the consumer account. The then SDO, Kadipur instead of putting the record to Audit, again charged the out of court settled amount. After that KCG Division came into existence and on the representation of the

complainant, this office wrote the letter to the SE for advice. The SE/Op. Circle, Gurgaon advised his office that the amount be withdrawn after obtaining the concurrence of CGM/Audit, DHBVN, Hisar and accordingly, wrote the letter to CGM/Audit for his concurrence. The CGM/Audit advised to put up all the relevant documents to AGM/Inspection, Gurgaon for verification. The AGM/Inspection was personally contacted by the CA of his office but the audit desired to put up the copies of ledgers since 5/2000. But inspite of personal visit of Ledger Clerk of his office, the SDO Kadipur had not put up/supplied the copies of ledger since 5/2000 with the reason that the relevant record is not traceable. Hence, the case is pending with audit for verification and concurrence.

The XEN, KCG Division was asked as to why the efforts have not been made by his office in putting the case to the CGM/Audit for his concurrence and the consumer is being harassed by charging the amount already settled and paid by the petitioner as per the direction of the High Court and as per the Sales Circular No. D-2/2009. Why the SDO had accepted the audit para when it was known to him that the case had already been settled under surcharge waiver off scheme.

The XEN, KCG Division was directed to trace out the documents as desired by the audit and put up the same to audit for his concurrence, otherwise this forum has no option but to fix the responsibility of the erring officials/officers, who had harassed the consumer for years together, as in this case, the consumer is not at fault and his time is wasting in getting the bill corrected from the office every month. Until the case is settled, the XEN, KCG Division is directed to accept the payment of current bill.

To-day, the petitioner and a representative of KCG Division was present. The representative of the KCG Division stated that the record pertaining to the petitioner correspondence is not traceable inspite of vigorous efforts. On the other hand, the petitioner was present that he is being harassed without any fault as he had deposited all the amount as per direction of Hon'ble Pb. & Haryana High Court as well as the Nigam circular No. D-2/2009 under surcharge waiver scheme but the Nigam is again charging the same amount to his current bill. Every time he had to go to the SDO office for part payments and requested for Redressal of his grievances.

After hearing the petitioner and keeping in view the statement of the XEN, who had shown inability and failed to produce the record in support of his claim, this forum found the contention of the petitioner in order. This forum ordered that the amount so charged to the petitioner, be withdrawn at once with surcharge as the petitioner had deposited the amount as per the Nigam Circular as per the policy. Only the payment of current bill be charged from the petitioner, as the consumer had been harassed by the then SDO and now XEN KCG Division, Gurgaon by charging the amount without any fault. The compliance be reported to this forum through Nodal Officer.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 517/2011**

**Date of institution : 3.10.2011**

**Date of decision : 20.10.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Rajinder Kumar ,H.No.165/6,Hans Enclave,Jaipur Road, Gurgaon.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Rajinder Kumar, r/o H.No.165/6, Hans Enclave, Jaipur Road, Gurgaon ,bearing a/c No.QH02-0644(ZD 1362),alleged therein that he is an ex-serviceman and was making the payment of energy bills. of an average units consumption @ 480 bi-monthly from 2008 to 2010. He further alleged that Sh.Sheoran,JE of the area had falsely implicated in a theft case and he was charged Rs 17000/- He contacted the SDO and the CA to rectify his bills but no action had been taken .

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer /SDO for his view point/reply.

Today, the SDO CCC Kadipur S/division ,DHBVN,Gurgqaon was present and submitted the reply of the petition vide his office memo No.8370 dated 20.10.2011, stated therein that a LL-1 No.19/12 dt 29.3.08 in the name of Sh.Rajinder Kumar S/o Sh.Ram Chander was filled up by the Operation Team. Against that LL-1, an amount of Rs.13817/- was charged on 29.03.2008 vide SC&AR No. 235/116R. After that Special Audit Party charged Rs.16703/- on dated 18.09.2009 vide half margin No. 202 dated 18.09.2009. Considering this LL-1 as theft of energy charges, they calculated the actual charges as Rs.30520/- against Rs.13817/-, which was already charged by the Operation Staff. The balance amount Rs.16703/- is debited in the consumer account on dated 15.01.2001 vide SC&AR No. 107/155R. Further, it is also intimated that the consumer is a habitual defaulter and he had paid Rs.3000/- on 15.01.2010 and after that he had paid Rs.25,000/- on 12.05.2011 after a lapse of 16 months. Now, the consumer is a defaulter of Rs.46096/-. The consumer was charged 480 units for the defective meter during period 7/2006 to 6/2008, which is on lower side as per his connected load.

After hearing the reply of the SDO, this is a clear cut case of theft of energy. This forum cannot adjudicate the case of theft of energy, being not empowered by the HERC. The Nodal Officer is directed that the SDO as well as staff of the sub-division had violated the instructions of the Nigam. He should take up the matter with the concerned XEN for taking disciplinary action against the Officer/Official of the Sub-division. The connection of the petitioner should have immediately been disconnected, after detection of theft of energy case and the petitioner had

enjoyed at his own will for not making the payment of energy bills for 16 months, which had now accumulated to Rs.46096/-. In this case, all the concerned officers/officials are responsible for not acted upon timely as per the prevailing Nigam's instructions.

Since, this is a theft case and this forum cannot adjudicate the theft case, the case is hereby rejected.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 518/2011**

**Date of Institution:18.10.2011**

**Date of Decision :20.12.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Prem Chand S/o Sh. Sohan Lal, Mohalla Gadia Wala, Hodel, Distt., Palwal.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Prem Chand, R/o Mohalla Gadia Wala, Hodel, Distt., Palwal against non correction of his bill.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 21.11.2011, the SDO was present but the petitioner was not present. The SDO submitted the reply vide his memo No. 2754 dated 18.11.2011, stated therein that the account of the petitioner has been overhauled and a refund of Rs.5418/- credited to the consumer account vide SC&AR No. 159 dated 20.10.2011 and bill for the same has already been delivered to the petitioner. The reply of the petitioner was not in order.

The SDO was asked as to why the MCO was not handed over the by the JE concerned to the revenue staff after replacement of the meter within the prescribed period for making the correct billing to the petitioner. What base has been taken by the revenue staff while overhauling the account of the petitioner? The consumption data for six months before replacement and after replacement of meter be brought on the next date so that the case is decided accordingly. A photocopy of the action taken report against the concerned JE who had not handed over the MCO the revenue section be also brought.

To-day, nor petitioner neither the respondent SDO was present. The petitioner was contacted as to whether; he is satisfied with the amount overhauled by the respondent SDO. The petitioner stated that he is fully satisfied with the action of SDO and requested for closer of the case.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 519/2011**  
**Date of institution: 19.10.2011**  
**Date of decision: 6.1.2012**

**In the matter of**

**Smt.Shakuntla W/O Sh.Hardeep, 123,Defence colony,Hisar.**

**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Nirmal Grover,Steno

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Smt. Shakuntla W/o Sh.Hardeep, Defence colony, Hisar against non release of electricity connection to her house, inspite of completed all the required formalities after taking the N.D.C. from the concerned office.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his view point/reply.

During the proceedings held on 8.11.2011, the SDO submitted the reply of the petition through the Nodal Officer vide his memo No. Ch-4/Forum-519/HSR dated 08.11.2011, stated therein that the premises where the connection is required by the petitioner is a defaulter premises amounting to Rs.49423/- which was charged vide SC&AR No. 47/369 dated 26.02.2010, as non consumer user Sh. Amit S/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar. It is further stated that the premises of consumer was checked bearing A/C No. D1-0331 in the name of Sh. Adh Ram, and LL-1 No. 27/214 dated 04.02.2006 was filled up by the staff of the S/Division and amount was charged Rs.78448/- as per Sales Circular No. D43/2005. He further stated that as per Nigam's Sales Circular No. D95/2001, the new connection cannot be released at the same premises, where the premises is defaulter. The NDC issued by the office of SDO vide memo No. 7342 dated 01.02.2011 against Account No. D1-0331, mentioning therein that this is without prejudice to right of Nigam to take further re-course for recovery of any amount found at later stage by the Nigam.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that he had purchased the house No. 123, Defence Colony, Hisar from one Sh. Satinder S/o Sh. Adh Ram and after obtaining NDC from DHBVN, he had got registered the house in the name of Smt. Shakuntla W/o Sh. Hardeep. After completing all the necessary formalities, he had applied for electricity connection in the same

premises. Later on, the staff of the sub-division had refused to release the new electricity connection being a defaulter premises, amounting to Rs. 49423/-. Why the NDC was issued to the owner of the premises before registering the premises, that no amount is outstanding against this account and premises. After obtaining the NDC from the department, he had applied for the same. If any amount was outstanding against this premise, he would not have registered the premises before clearing the defaulting amount. Now, he is not responsible for any amount to be paid by him before release of the connection. The amount should be got recovered by transferring the same in the electricity account of the owner of the house who had sold this house to him and is residing at Hisar. His connection be got released at the earliest.

After hearing the version of the SDO, as well as the statement of the petitioner, this forum has concluded that why the NDC was issued to the owner of the house, being defaulter. This is done with the connivance of the Nigam officials who had issued NDC to the defaulter. The Nodal Officer was directed to take up the matter with the concerned SDO and get the matter enquired at his level and the report be submitted to this forum on or before the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 06.12.2011. In the mean time, the entire defaulting amount be placed against the miscellaneous advances of the officials who had issued the wrong NDC to the owner of the house and the connection of the petitioner be released.

During the hearing held on 6.12.2011, the petitioner was present and the respondent SDO was present. The Nodal Officer was asked to submit the enquiry report as was directed during the last proceedings held on 08.11.2011 but the Nodal Officer has not conducted any enquiry into the case and the case has been viewed very seriously. The SDO has stated that the matter is being taken with the LR, HVPN, Panchkula for taking his advice for contesting against the order of the Forum.

After hearing the SDO, the SDO was directed that this forum has nothing to do with the advice of the LR and to release the connection of the petitioner without any further delay. The Nigam has not loose any amount of the defaulter pending against him as the entire defaulting amount be placed in the miscellaneous advances of the concerned official/s responsible for issue the NDC without verifying the record or connivance with the then defaulter.

The SDO has given in writing that he will release the connection of the petitioner within two weeks time after completing all usual formalities. The case was adjourned to the next date.

Today, the SDO as well as the representative of the petitioner was present. The SDO stated that as per the Order of the Forum, the connection of the

petitioner has been released and requested for closer of the case. On other other hand, the counsel of the petitioner has also stated that the connection of his client has been released by the SDO and he is satisfied with the decision of the Forum.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to precede the case further; hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 520/2011**  
**Date of Institution:19.10.2011**  
**Date of Decision :20.12.2011**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Vikram Yadav, H.No.81, Sector-10/A, Gurgaon.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Present in person.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Vikram Yadav, H.No.81, Sector-10/A, Gurgaon against non implementation of the decision of the CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar dated 22.07.2010.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 21.11.2011, the SDO/CCC, Kadipur was present and he submitted the reply of the petition vide memo No. 8522 dated 21.11.2011 stated therein that a sum of Rs.21448/- was charged by his office on account of short assessment from 7/2007 to 5/2008 vide SC&AR No. 2/8R. The old meter was replaced by the Nigam and the MCO of the same was not fed in the consumer account. The new meter consumption of 8636 units was not billed against the consumer account and the bill was raised on average basis @ 600 units bimonthly for the period 7/2007 to 5/2008. The then office staff of his office overhauled the account of the consumer considering the new meter reading i.e. 8636 units after adjusting the units billed on average basis and charged a sum of Rs.21448/- on account of short assessment on 18.06.2008. Then a sum of Rs.21358/- was credited by the staff vide SC&AR No. 8/2R on 24.09.2008. Further, during the special audit, the audit party charged Rs.21358/- vide half margin No. 246 on account of wrong refund. The audit party vide half margin No. 247, wrongly charged the another amount Rs.21468/-.

As per the order of Hon'ble CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar dated 22.07.2010, Rs.21358/- and Rs.22756/- on dated 28.06.2010 and 22.07.2010 respectively, were credited in the account of the petitioner vide SC&AR No. 290/39R. But his office again charged amounts of Rs.21358/- and Rs.21468/- vide SC&AR No. 91/156R and 136/155R respectively as

per direction of CGM/Audit. The SDO further stated that out of Rs.42826/-, Rs.21448/- is chargeable on account of short assessment for the period 7/2007 to 5/2008 and the remaining amount is not chargeable due to double entry. This amount shall be refunded to the petitioner after obtaining the approval from CGM/Audit within one month.

To-day, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO has submitted vide his memo No. 8094 dated 19.12.2011 that the petitioner Sh. Vikram Yadav had visited his office and he was fully convinced. Accordingly, he deposited the amount Rs.28442/- against the amount of Rs.42826/-. The remaining amount of Rs.21468/- which was charged from the petitioner wrongly will be refunded to the petitioner on receipt of the concurrence from the office of Chief Auditor, DHBVN, Hisar for which the matter had already been referred to his office.

On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he was asked whether he is satisfied or not with the decision of the SDO, he stated that he is satisfied with the decision of the SDO. After hearing the petitioner, the SDO was directed that the balance amount be adjusted in the next bill of the petitioner after receipt of the concurrence from the CGM/Audit, DHBVN, Hisar under intimation to the forum through the Nodal Officer.

Since, the petitioner is satisfied with the decision of the forum, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 521/2011**

**Date of institution: 28.10.2011**

**Date of decision: 6.1.2012**

**In the matter of**

**Sh.Balwant Singh S/oSh.Amar Singh,r/o H.No.72,Het Ram Park, Near Camp Chowk, Hisar .**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh.Nirmal Grover,Steno to N.O.

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Balwant Singh S/o Sh. Amar Singh, r/o Hisar against excess bill amounting to Rs 97353/- inspite of payment of bills being made regularly.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer/SDO for his view point/reply.

During the proceedings held on 8.11.2011, the SDO had submitted the reply of the petition through the Nodal Officer vide memo no. Ch-4/Forum-521/HSR dated 08.11.2011, stated therein that the meter of the consumer was replaced vide MCO No. 84972/10-11 on 09.04.2011, being meter block burnt. The reading of the burnt meter was recorded as 47610. The complainant had lodged a request on 24.06.2011 for overhauling the account on the basis of new meter. The consumer had been billed up to 25294 units, in the month of December, 2010 and on the basis of final reading i.e. 47610 units, the difference was charged vide SC &AR No. 392/65 amounting to Rs.100274/-.

It is pertinent to mention here that the consumption of the consumer recorded after MCO is 1994 Units for 11 days of 04/2011 i.e. from the date of effect of MCO dated 09.04.2011 to 20.04.2011 (reading date) and 3760 for the period 20.04.2011 to 20.06.2011, 3755 for the period 20.06.2011 to 23.08.2011 and 3151 for the period 23.08.2011 to 19.10.2011. It is also stated that the connected load of the consumer is 7 KW.

The amount so charged is correct as the complainant has consumed the units 22316 from 20.12.2010 to 09.04.2011.

The meter of consumer was replaced due to meter block burnt which may due to technical fault/sparking in the meter block. It is pertain to mention here that there is no direct relevancy in between reading recorded by energy meter and

meter block burnt hence the consumption recorded by the old meter is genuine and correct, however the same consumption might be accumulated by the meter reader.

After going through the reply of the SDO, this is a clear cut case of accumulation of reading. Before taking any decision in the case, the SDO was directed to visit the site of the petitioner and check the load. He was further directed to bring the data of the consumer i.e. the date of connection and the month wise reading data till date, so that the case could be decided accordingly. In the mean time, current bill payment be accepted from the petitioner.

During the proceedings held on 6.12.2011, the petitioner was present and the SDO has stated that the meter had had not jumped. The reading had been accumulated by the Meter Reader with the connivance of the petitioner. This is clear as per the consumption data before the replacement of meter and after replacement of meter. After seeing the consumption data and statement of SDO, this forum had given the order to the SDO that the petitioner accounts be overhauled on the basis of the consumption shown by the new meter, as per the consumption data of the petitioner. The correct/overhauled billed be supplied to the petitioner within 7 days and report compliance on the next date. The XEN/Op. Division No.1, DHBVN, Hisar was requested to enquire into the roll of Meter Reader/HESL personnel while taking the reading of the petitioner and other consumers in the area. The loss so sustained by the Nigam while overhauling the bill of the petitioner be deducted from the salary of Meter Reader/HESL personnel, as this is a case of accumulation of meter reading. The case is adjourned to the next date.

Today, the SDO as well as the petitioner was present. The SDO has submitted a letter vide his memo No.12068 dated 6.1.2012, stated that as per the order of the Forum, the bill of the petitioner has been overhauled on the basis of consumption data after replacement of defective meter and an amount of Rs 28112/- has been credited to his account. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and stated that he is satisfied with the decision of the Forum and requested for closer of his case. During the proceedings held on 6.12.2011, this Forum that Xen OP.Divn.No.I,Hisar shall conduct an enquiry into the role of Meter Reader/HESL Personnel for accumulating the reading of the petitioner and will be submit his action taken report on the next date of hearing i.e. to-day 06.01.2012, but the report has not been received by the SDO nor the XEN concerned. The Nodal Officer is directed to pursue the matter with the concerned XEN and will ensure submission of the action taken report within 10 days positively. He is further directed that the loss sustained by the Nigam on account of overhauling the

account of the petitioner, the refunded amount be placed in the miscellaneous advances of the Meter Reader/HESL Personnel.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 522/2011**

**Date of Institution:02.11.2011**

**Date of Decision: 17.02.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Ashok Kumar Pathak, H.No.10, Sector-9, Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Ashok Kumar Pathak, H.,No.10, Sector-9, Faridabad against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 21.11.2011, the SDO was present and he submitted the vide his memo No. 3749 dated 18.11.2011, stated therein that the petitioner has submitted his application on 10.10.2011 regarding excess unit consumption of 8185 units against which Sh. Ravinder Kaushik, JE In-charge area inspected the meter and submitted his report along with connected load. Reading 16624 units, seals intact. As per report of the JE, nothing is adjustable. The bill served to the petitioner is as per the actual consumption and requested for closer of the case.

During the proceedings held on 20.12.2011, the petitioner as well as the representative of the SDO was present. The representative of the SDO submitted a copy of SDO vide memo No.3972 dated 19.12.2011 stated therein that the complainant has deposited Rs.57985/- on 9.12.2011 against energy bill of the same amount.

On the other hand, the petitioner submitted a memo dated 19.12.2011 stated as under:

1. The details of the case as also irresponsible, obstructionist and questionable behavior of concerned staff (the JE and the SDO) are given in succeeding paragraphs.
2. Electricity bill for the period 26.6.2011 to 26.8.2011 given to me was Rs.45156/- . This was excessive since my all other bi-monthly bills have been between Rs.10000/- to 15000/-.

3. When I brought to the notice of SDO, the response of Mr. Dhull, SDO was very un-helpful. He asked me to submit an application and deposit money for check meter.
4. The JE informed me that my meter was checked and has been found functioning well. In my opinion, the JE has in fact taken no action and gave this reply without going into the proper procedure. When I confronted him with this, he asked me to give another application along with Rs.100/-, so that a check meter can be installed along with the current meter to find out the error if any.
5. I have paid the above bills. The SDO and the JE have taken no serious action to investigate this obvious error. They have not given timely and appropriate information. Their attitude has been very casual and aggressive. I and my representative have been harassed.

After hearing the version of the petitioner, the representative of the SDO was directed to get the meter checked from the M&P lab before installation of check meter. If the report of M&P lab regarding working of the meter is found O.K., there is no idea to install the check meter. This was also told to the petitioner who was present. He agrees with the suggestion made by this forum to the representative of the SDO. The representative of the SDO was also directed to get the meter checked in the presence of the petitioner for which the date and time for sending the meter to the M&P Lab will be fixed with the petitioner and report of the M&P checking be brought by the SDO himself on the next date of hearing, so that further order could be passed by this forum accordingly.

To-day, the SDO was not present and he was required to submit the M&P checking report of the meter as was directed during the last hearing held on 20.12.2011 in person but the SDO was not present up to 12.30 P.M. Later on at about 1.00 P.M. (Noon), the UDC of the sub-division reported before the Forum. He was asked about the non-presence of the SDO, the official stated that the SDO has gone to Hisar.

The actions on the part of the SDO for not presenting himself before the Forum for submission of the report has been viewed seriously. It has been learnt that the SDO in the past also, had tried to ignore the Forum while hearing the cases on one pretext or the other. In this context, a penalty of Rs.300/- was also imposed against the SDO for not attending the Forum. The SE/Admn. DHBVN, Hisar was requested to issue a letter of advice in that case, to be more careful while attending the consumer cases before the forum. But the SDO has again ignored direction of the Forum. The SDO is directed not to repeat such things in future, failing which the matter shall be reported to the higher authorities for initiating disciplinary action.

The UDC of the sub-division submitted the checking report of the meter of the petitioner vide his memo No. 90 dated 12.01.2012, along with checking report of M&P lab,

stating therein that the meter of the petitioner was removed in his presence from the site for checking the accuracy in the M&P lab on 11.01.2012. The meter was checked by the lab on 11.01.2012 in the presence of petitioner and the JE Incharge. The meter accuracy was found within limit. The complainant refused to sign on the checking report of M&P. Since, the report of meter is O.K., as declared by M&P, the version of the petitioner that the meter had shown excess reading in the meter is not found in order. The action of the SDO by charging the amount as per consumption is found in order; hence the case of the petitioner is hereby dismissed.

Since, the case is dismissed; there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 523/2011

Date of Institution: 04.11.2011

Date of Decision :21.11.2011

In the matter of

**Sh. Chiranji Lal S/o Sh. Girdhari Lal, H.No.264B, Sector-6, Dharuhera, Distt., Rewari.**  
V/s **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Chiranji Lal, HJ./No.264B, Sector-6, Dharuhera against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present and he submitted the reply of the petition through Nodal Officer. The SDO has stated in his reply that a sum of Rs.25255/- was charged during 7/2011 vide SC&AR No. 114/R-117. This amount has been charged on account of half margin No. 59/102 dated 09.12.2009. The premises of the complainant was checked by Sh. Prem Singh, the then SDO/Op., Dharuhera and found resale of energy to his neighbourer Sh. Sanjay Chauhan, R/o H.No.279, Housing Board, Dharuhera on 22.01.2008. The connected load was found 160 Watt as per LL-1 No. 13/748 which also bears signature of the consumer. The audit party charged Rs.25255/- as the staff of the sub-division charged the amount to the petitioner earlier was Rs.743/- which was not as per the load and as per the Nigam's instructions.

After hearing the version of the SDO, this is a case of theft of energy and this forum cannot adjudicate the case of theft of energy as per HERC regulation. The case is hereby rejected.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(R.V.Bari)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 524/2011**  
**Date of Institution:21.09.2011**  
**Date of Decision:06.12.2011**

**In the matter of**

**Sh. Rajal S/o Sh. Khetiya, V&P.O. Bamla, Distt., Bhiwani**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Present.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Rajal S/o Sh. Khetiya, V&P.O. Bamla, Distt., Bhiwani against billing him on wrong name. His actually name while applied the connection was Rajal S/o Sh. Khetiya but the name in the bill being issued to him is in the name of Rajpal.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present. He stated before the forum that the name of the petitioner has been corrected and as necessary advice for change of name has been submitted to the computer section for correcting the name of the petitioner. The next bill will be issued to the petitioner with correct name of Sh. Rajal. On the other hand, the petitioner was present and he was satisfied with the statement of SDO.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(A.K.Tiwari)**  
**Chairman**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbnv.com](http://www.dhbnv.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbnv@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbnv@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 525/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 14.11.2011**  
**Date of Decision: 17.02.2012**

**In the matter of**

**Smt. Promila Sikka, President, Windsor, DLF City, Phase-IV, Gurgaon.**

**V/s**

**DHBNV**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

Sh. N.P.Sharma, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Smt. Promila Sikka, President, Hamilton Court, Regency Park-II, Windsor, DLF City, Phase-IV, Gurgaon, stated therein that the XEN, KCG Division had released illegal demand vide his memo dated 04.11.2010 amounting to Rs.89,64,640/-, based on a survey carried out, as arrear due to difference in tariff between BS domestic and BS non domestic supply. They have deposited amount of the difference between BS Non domestic and BS domestic with the Nigam. He further stated that some other similarly affected Residents Welfare Associations filed a petition against the DHBNV demands with the HERC and as per the HERC Orders dated 3.9.2010, held that the domestic needs were not fully taken care by the Commission's order on domestic tariff dated 22.12.2000. The Commission agreed with the view of our Residential Associations that statutorily under different laws/National building codes, they have to compulsorily maintain lifts, pumps, fire fighting equipments etc to make high rise buildings safe and functional for residential use. Consequently, it was ordered that loads of lifts, fire fighting equipment and water supply pumps would hence forth be included as part of domestic use within 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in commission order dated 13.10.2006. But the Commission, however, did not pass any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from Consumer to Consumer and advised the associations to approach the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, set up by the Licensee. That the spirit of the HERC order dated 13.10.2006, was to give some benefit to the multistoried housing complexes who are taking bulk supply connection at 11KV and distribution of electricity up to the apartment. The costing would include operation & maintenance of back up power( mandatory) ,transmission & distribution losses ,spares and break down maintenance, manpower etc. In the absence of bulk supply, all these services would have been at the cost of DHBNV. The common facilities have not been defined in the circular which is the reason for the dispute of above amount.

It is, therefore, prayed that the amount charged by the XEN, KCG Division vide his notice dated 04.11.2010, amounting to Rs.89,64,640/- may kindly be quashed and a interest of the above amount @ 15% per annum may kindly be paid w.e.f. 14.06.2011. Moreover, a lump-sum compensation amounting to Rs.10,00,000/- for causing extreme physical and mental hardship to

the residents of the Condominiums on account of harassment faced by them may also be ordered along with Rs.55,000/- as cost of litigation.

On the other hand, Sh.Manoj Yadav, respondent Xen was not present but his representative was present and he submitted the reply of the petition of the petitioner vide his office memo No.750 dated 09.12.2011, stating therein that the extension of load of the complainant (earlier connection in the name of M/s DLF Services Ltd., A/c No. BS-10) from 991 KW to 1998 KW with contact demand 1100 KVA to 2000 KVA was affected on 19.03.2005. At the time of release of extension of load, the complainant has supplied the details of load along with test report mentioning therein category wise load very clearly (copy attached). From this test report, the load of common utility was declared as 696 KW against total sanctioned load of 1998 KW. After that as per the HERC order Sales Instruction No. 62/2006 dated 04.11.2006 was issued by the DHBVN. But instead of checking the load details available on files and without physical checking of the premises, the sub-division concerned starts charging the tariff of BS/DS category.

After that vide SJO dated 03.10.2007, the change of name from M/s DLF Services Ltd. To M/s Hamilton Court, Windsor Court and Regency Park effected on 03.11.2007. This time also along with test report, the Condominium Association have supplied the details of load of common utility which was much more than the limit of 15% as per the prevailing instructions at that time. But this time also BS/DS tariff will remain continue. This issue of tariff was reconsidered by Hon'ble HERC by giving opportunity of hearing and vide their order dated 03.09.2010, it was decided that henceforth the load of fire fighting, lifts and water supply would be a part of domestic load. It has also been mentioned very clearly that this order would be applicable with prospective effect only. So, as per the contents of the HERC order which was not applicable for previous period, hence the difference of tariff which was less charged worth Rs.99,31,851/- was informed to the complainant through a Show Cause Notice bearing memo No.2893 dated 04.11.2010. This time, there was inadvertently mistake in calculation and after having detail discussion with the representative of complainant, the revised current amount worth Rs.89,64,640/- was intimated to them.

After that the representative of RWA met 3-4 times to the undersigned and the case was deliberated in length. After having convinced with the amount charged, the complainant made the entire payment of bill in the month of 6/2011 with the understanding that the amount is rightly chargeable and they are liable to make the payment.

Keeping in view the details mentioned above, it is requested that appeal file by the complainant may kindly be dismissed.

On the other hand, the representative of the petitioner was present. He stated that the counsel of the petitioner had gone somewhere and requested for another date. Request granted. The next date of hearing is fixed for 19.01.2012, for his view point over the reply of the XEN, KCG Division, DHBVN, Gurgaon.

The hearing on dated 19.01.2012, could not take place due to non-completion of the forum quorum and the date was postponed to 17.02.2012.

To-day, the counsel of petitioner was present and stated in defence of the case, that the Nigam had harassed many residents of the apartments by charging illegal tariff from BS to NDS. He further stated that as per Sales Circular No. 62/2006, in which it is clearly mentioned that a

separate and distinct category of consumers was created described as Bulk Domestic Category where the connected load of residential and domestic use should be at least 85% of the total connected load. The balance 15% shall be for common facilities and no industrial activity will be permitted. The consumers were to be billed at a special rate of Rs.3.50/- per unit of power consumed instead of earlier rate of Rs.4.09/- w.e.f. 01.11.2006. It was also mentioned therein that the connected load was 1998 KW of power and further that the connected load of residential/domestic use was 90% and the balance was used for common services like Elevators, Ventilation, Water Supply and Lighting purpose etc. Moreover, as per HERC order dated 03.09.2010, it is clear mentioned that the connected load of Lift/Fire Fighting Equipments and Water Supply Pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible 85% of the total connected load as mentioned in the Commission order dated 13.10.2006. The order dated 03.09.2010 would be implemented with prospective effect only i.e. from the date of issue of this order. The commission had not passed any order on the issue of arrears claimed by the Nigam as the status may vary from consumer to consumer. In such an eventuality, the consumer may approach the CGRF set up by Distribution Licensee in their respective area for Redressal of their grievances.

He prayed that thus all intents and purposes invoking the statutory protection as accorded, no sum is recoverable/chargeable from the complainant by the respondent/Nigam for a period exceeding two years prior to 04.11.2010, when the demand was raised for the first time, hence for all purposes any demands of the Nigam which comprise of demands raised for the period prior to 04.11.2010 in this scenario stands extinguished for all times to come. The demand notice is thus liable to be set aside on this ground.

On the other hand, Sh. Manoj Yadav, XEN, KCG Divn., DHBVN, Gurgaon was present and stated that he had already submitted the detailed reply of the petition during the proceedings held on 20.12.2011, which may kindly be perused. His version is that as per Sales Instruction No.15/2010 of the Nigam, the connected load of the fire fighting equipments, lifts and water supply pumps would henceforth be included as part of domestic use within the permissible limit 85% of the total connected load w.e.f. 3.9.2010, and the Nigam is now charging as per the revised Sales Circular and as per the Commission's order dated 13.10.2006. He has not violated any Nigam instructions nor harassed the petitioner on account of charging the revised tariff.

After hearing both the parties, & going through the facts, it is concluded that as per the instructions of the Nigam at that time, the amount was rightly chargeable as the extra load beyond the permissible limit of 15% of common area load were found at site and the XEN had charged the amount according to the increased load & the same amount have also been deposited by the petitioner, so there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File is consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 526/2011**  
**Date of Institution:14.11.2011**  
**Date of Decision :21.02.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Smt. Dayawanti W/o Sh. Chander Bhan, H.No.190, Patel Nagar, Hisar.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.

Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Nirmal Grover, Steno to N.O.

**ORDER**

A petition of Smt. Dayawanti, H.No.190, Patel Nagar, Hisar was received through the counsel of the petitioner, Sh. P.S.Saini.

That his client's A/C No. is KK0N-0298 with sanctioned load 1 KW. The Nigam has issued a wrong bill of 2194 units in 11/2010. This bill is wrong and illegal.

That the applicant has consumed said units, it is due to jumping of reading, due to deficiency on the part of the respondent.

That the applicant is not liable to pay said amount. The connection of the applicant is running.

That the applicant visited the office of respondent and lodged her grievances on 23.12.2010 but in vain and refused to accept the bill of average consumption which is on record.

That this meter had earlier also jumped and charged/jumped units had been withdrawn by this Hon'ble court.

That Nigam did not bother to replace the meter with new one, reasons are known to them.

That applicant is suffering at the hands of Nigam without her fault.

It is therefore prayed that the said bill of 2194 units for 11/2010 may kindly be set aside and charge the amount on average basis as per Nigam's rules and replace the meter.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 06.12.2011, the SDO as well as the counsel of the petitioner was present. The SDO submitted the reply through the Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar, stated therein;

That it is true that the complainant is a bonafide consumer of the Nigam and having an electric connection bearing A/C No. KK0N/0298 (sanctioned load 2.00 KW) at House No. 190, Patel Nagar, Hisar.

That the consumer has been billed up to 8021 units in the month of 9/2010.

That it is pertinent to mention here that the consumer has represented to his office vide consumer request No. 111237369 for checking the meter/wrong reading. On this complaint, meter was checked by Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, JE on dated 03.01.2011 and a check meter was installed at the parallel of consumer meter at the site on 7958 units. Now, the reading was checked by Sh. Rajesh Kaushik, JE on 30.11.2011 in the check meter and found 9531 units.

Keeping in view the reading in the check meter, the account of the petitioner has been overhauled and a sum of Rs.6420/- has been adjusted and requested for closer of the case.

On the other hand, the counsel of petitioner was present and a copy of reply of SDO was handed over to the counsel of the petitioner for his viewpoint. The counsel of petitioner requested that he may be given time to study and discussion with his client. His request was granted and the case was adjourned to the next date.

During the proceedings held on 06.01.2012, the SDO as well as the counsel of the petitioner was present. The SDO stated that he had already overhauled the account of the petitioner, amounting to Rs.6420/- and requested for closer of case. On the other hand, the counsel of the petitioner stated that due to some reasons, he could not contact his client about the overhauling of the bill by the SDO and requested for next date. Request granted.

To-day, the SDO was present and stated that he has already overhauled the account of the petitioner in the ledger and a refund of Rs.6420/-, has been credited in the account of the petitioner. On the other hand, the petitioner's counsel was present and he was apprised of the same. The counsel sought another adjournment by demanding some documents. The SDO was directed to give the same documents to the counsel of the petitioner as and when demanded relating to this case. The counsel of petitioner was satisfied with the direction imparted to the SDO.

Since, the cause of action is over, no further proceedings are required. The case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 527/2011  
Date of Institution: 15.11.2011  
Date of Decision :20.12.2011

In the matter of  
Sh. Ranjeet Kumar, H.No.2380, Sector-16, Faridabad.  
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Ranjeet Kumar, H.No.2380, Sector-16, Faridabad against wrong billing.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 21.11.2011, Sh. Raj Kumar, CA and a representative of petitioner was also present. The CA of the sub-division submitted the reply of the petition vide his office memo No.2374 dated 18.11.11. After going through the reply of the respondent SDO, the same was not found convincing and moreover, the calculations made by the SDO while correcting the bill of the petitioner, were of confusing type for which the CA was directed to submit the reply of the petition properly which should be self explanatory through the SDO along with all relevant record, so that the case could be decided accordingly on the next date.

To-day, the SDO was present and he submitted that due to non visibility of reading in the old meter, the billing was made to the petitioner on an average basis. Now to redress the grievances of the petitioner, the reading base of 899 units was taken i.e. prior to the defect/replacement of the meter, which was on higher side. He further stated that the meter of the petitioner has been replaced vide MCO No. 6/1064 effected on 03.08.2011. The meter replaced on display not working vide CA22 No.27/430. Till the reading is received during the next three billing cycles, the account of the petitioner will be overhauled on the basis of consumption prior to defect of the meter and the reading base of 899 units will be taken which was in higher side in the months.

After hearing the SDO, the version of the SDO was found in order and the SDO was directed to take action as per the statement made by him before the forum after the concurrence of Audit. The compliance be reported after overhauling the account of the

petitioner to this forum through the Nodal Officer. Since, the SDO has agreed before the forum for overhauling the account of the petitioner, there is no idea to keep the case pending for a more time, hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 528/2011  
Date of Institution: 25.11.2011  
Date of decision :20.12.2011.

In the matter of  
Smt. Veena Gupta W/o Sh. Anil Gupta, H.No.35, Sector-15A, Faridabad.  
V/s DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Smt. Veena Gupta w/o Sh. Anil Gupta, H.No.35, Sector-15A, Faridabad, regarding showing extra arrear amounting to Rs 348/ in her monthly bills is being shown, although she is making the payment of energy bills regularly. She further stated that she had visited many times in the office to correct of her bill but no action had been action.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

Today the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition, stated therein that the complaint of the petitioner has been gone through and accordingly, a sum of Rs 348/- has been refunded through the sundry item No.181/142 accordingly, which will be reflected in the next bill of the petitioner and requested for closer of the case.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO respondent, there is no idea to precede the case; hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 529/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 25.11.2011**  
**Date of Decision: 17.02.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. J.P.Paul, H.No.659, Sector-18, Faridabad.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: None.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. J.P.Paul, H.No.659, Sector-18, Faridabad regarding charging of excess amount on account of defective meter.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 20.12.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner was not present. The representative of SDO submitted the reply of the petition which is not in order. The representative was directed to submit the reply of the petition para wise on the next date of hearing which is fixed for 19.1.2012 through the SDO.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted the detailed reply vide his memo No. 100 dated 17.01.2012, stating therein that the premises of the consumer was checked by Sh. Dharam Raj, JE on 15.04.2011 and the load was found 5.398 KW against the sanctioned load of 2 KW. The meter was also found burnt and the reading was not visible. The penalty for un-authorized load found at site including difference of ACD was charged vide sundry item No. 373/R108, amounting to Rs.4400/-. Later on the MCO was issued on dated 18.04.2011 vide No.99/163 and the same was affected on 24.12.2011.

A notice was served to the consumer to deposit the penalty and further submission of documents for regularization of the un-authorized load but the consumer has not reported to the office and the case has been filed by the petitioner before the Forum.

Keeping in view the reply of the SDO, the version of the SDO is found in order as the SDO had acted as per the Nigam Instructions for charging the penalty for un-authorized extension of load.

Since, the petitioner is not attending the Forum for the reasons best known to him for his view point over the reply of the SDO, the case cannot be kept pending, hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(Rajesh Kumar)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 530/2011

Date of Institution: 28.11.2011

Date of decision : 20.12.2011

In the matter of

**Sh. Narender Singh, Plot No.388, Sector-65, Faridabad.**

**V/s**

**DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh.Narinder Singh,Plot No.388,Sector 65,Faridabad regarding non raising of energy bills and charging of surcharge on the accumulated amount by the Nigam., without his fault.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

Today, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition, stated therein that the complaint o the petitioner was gone through and accordingly, an explanation of billing agency was called, wherein they have replied that the premises of the consumer remains closed and no one stays there. Moreover, the meter was removed on the defaulting amount of Rs 7994/- which was paid by consumer but in the complaint, the consumer has raised objection on the surcharge amount. The surcharge amount has been re-calculated on the prorata basis, assuming the total units consumed, being divided equally in bimonthly billing. Now the amount of Rs 3023/- has been refunded in the consumer account. Mover, as per the request of consumer, the connection has been disconnected and account has been closed. The grievances of consumer has redressed and requested for closer of the case.

On the other hand, the petitioner was not present and he was contacted on telephone, he stated that he is satisfied with the decision of SDO and requested for closer of his case.

Since the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further; hence the case is closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
**D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005**  
**(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))**

---

**Case No. 531/2011**  
**Date of Institution: 29.11.2011**  
**Date of Decision: 20.03.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Jogi Ram S/o Sh. Harphool, Ward No.10, V&P.O. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar.**  
**V/s DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant: Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.  
Present on behalf of Respondent: Sh.Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer.

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Jogi Ram S/o Sh. Harphool, Ward No.10, V&P.O. Narnaund, Distt., Hisar against wrong billing and harassment meted out to him by Sh. Ramesh & Sh. Satbir Singh, both Linemen in the Sub-division. The petitioner alleged in his petition that DS connection was released in his Kacha House during 2009 and thereafter, no bill of energy consumption had been received by over one year. He lodged a complaint with the sub-division and on the basis of complaint, two persons of Nigam namely Sh. Ramesh & Sh. Satbir Singh, both Linemen visited his house. They stated that your bill is due to the tune of Rs.12000/- and if you will pay to us, then your bill amount shall be got deposited with the office and in future your bill will come according to the consumption. He immediately given the amount to both the officials i.e. Rs.12000/- plus Rs.1500/- (as amount of refreshment). Thereafter, he had received a bill of Rs.160/- and the same was deposited by him on 23.06.2009. In the mean time, no bill had been received by him. Now, a bill amounting to Rs.28640/- has been received with due date of depositing the same in 21.10.2011.

There were some inconsistencies in the statements/facts given by the petitioner in his applications.

During the proceedings of the Forum held on 06.12.2011, the SDO as well as the petitioner were present. The petitioner stated that the date of release of connection as given by him in his earlier petition was wrong being the same got written from another person of his village. Now, a fresh application may kindly be accepted and on the basis of this representation, the case may please be dealt.

The revised representation of the petitioner was gone through and the SDO was asked to submit the reply. The SDO stated before the Forum that no doubt, the petitioner is a BPL consumer and having a Kacha Kotha. As per record, his office had issued the bill to the petitioners from time to time but the version of the petitioner for not receiving the electricity bill from the Nigam cannot be ruled out.

After hearing the SDO, this Forum directed the SDO to rectify the bill on the basis of actual reading in the meter or on the basis of MMC, if the meter is found defective/dead stop, up to date, as the petitioner is a BPL consumer and can not afford to pay on an average basis billing. The compliance of above be reported by the next date of hearing fixed for 06.01.2012.

Regarding the allegation of payment made by the petitioner and the said amount not being adjusted in his bill by the office of SDO, amounting to Rs.12000/- plus Rs.1500/- as he stated to have paid to the Nigam officials, who went to his house after representation made by him for not receiving the electricity bills for months together, for checking of meter and payment taken from the petitioner on the spot without giving any receipt is required to be investigated for their conduct and integrity, as this Forum cannot take action without the authentic proof or enquiry report. In this regard, a Committee of two Officers consisting of XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi & Nodal Officer, CGRF, DHBVN, Hisar constituted to conduct the enquiry into the allegations made by the petitioner against Sh. Ramesh and Sh. Satbir, ALM/Linemen of Narnaund Sub-Division. On the basis of enquiry report, the matter shall be reported to the higher authorities for initiating disciplinary action against the delinquent officials, if the allegation of the petitioner is found genuine/true, under intimation to this Forum, by the next date of hearing.

During the subsequent proceedings held on 06.01.2012, the SDO as well as the counsel of the petitioner were present. As per the directions of the Forum given during the last proceedings, the enquiry report of the Committee was required to be furnished before the Forum, but no enquiry report was put up to the Forum. Since, the Nodal Officer was not present, the Steno to Nodal Officer was directed to inform the Nodal Officer to submit the enquiry report by the next date of hearing, so that the petition could be decided accordingly.

On the other hand, the SDO submitted a letter before the Forum, duly countersigned by XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi, stating therein that the petitioner had given an application to correct his bill on dated 19.08.2009, as he is receiving the bill on average basis instead of actual reading. The petitioner confirmed in this application that his meter is O.K. and he wanted bills on actual reading basis. Accordingly, his account was adjusted in 10/2009 vide SC&AR No. 8/190 and a bill of Rs.15816/- was issued to him. But after adjustment, he did not come forward to deposit the bill and the bill accumulated to Rs.30492/-. When his (SDO) office stressed upon him to pay the energy bill, he raised false and frivolous complaint before the Forum to avoid making payment of huge defaulting amount with one pretext or the other. From the above, the petitioner does not want to pay the energy bill. The SDO further stated that the allegation of making money to two numbers Nigam's officials amounting to Rs.12000/- in lieu of payment of bill, his (SDO) office had not authorized any person to collect the payment from the petitioner at his residence. If he had made any payment to the un-authorized person, this fact should have been brought into the knowledge of the SDO at that time, but he never reported the

same. It is, therefore, prayed that the complaint of the petitioner may please be filed and he be directed to make the payment of energy bill pending against him.

Since, the report of the Committee constituted was not put up, the case was adjourned to the next date.

During the proceedings held on 21.02.2012, the SDO was not present nor the Nodal Officer was present. A representative of the SDO was present and he furnished a letter dated 05.12.2011 signed by one 'Jyoti' and witnessed by one Sh. Ram Avtar Sharma as proof of having been received the electricity bill by the petitioner. The counsel of petitioner objected to this proof. He stated that the statement submitted by the representative of the SDO is false and got signed from minor girl and moreover, there is no counter sign of the SDO on this statement.

The Committee of Nodal Officer and XEN/Op. Division, DHBVN, Hansi constituted for joint checking submitted its report stating that;

1. It is correct that the complainant's electric connection was released in December, 1993. As per record, PDCO was affected due to defaulting amount in the year 1996 and billing stopped. The complainant made payment of defaulting amount and supply was restored. But billing could not started after RCO. The record of the period after RCO was not available on the date of visit of Committee. It is further added that the meter was changed during the year 2004 and same meter is installed at present.
2. It is also correct that the complainant requested in the office of SDO, 'OP' Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaund on dated 19.08.2009, the meter got checked through the employee of Nigam and accordingly the bill raised on reading basis. Further bills raised by the Nigam are on the basis of reading/units consumed.
3. During the investigation, Sh. Jogi Ram S/o Sh. Harphool, resident of Narnaund was seems in wavering situation. Further, Sh. Phool Kumar S/o Sh. Pit Ram, resident of Narnaund was also called upon through the representative of SDO, 'OP' S/U Sub-Division, DHBVN, Narnaund office, but no one appeared.
4. Sh. Satyabir S/o Sh. Dwarka, Lineman has been transferred and presently working in 'OP' S/U Sub Division, DHBVN, Ratia and Sh Ramesh had died.
5. Further, notice has been issued to Sh. Satyabir, Lineman and Sh. Phool Kumar vide DGM-cum-Nodal Officer, DHBVN, Hisar office memo No. Ch-5/Forum-531/HSR dated 05.01.2012 to appear before the Committee.
6. None of them appeared before the Committee on the date i.e. on 10.01.2012.
7. The Committee is of the view that if the complainant is aggrieved then he must lodge FIR in the Police Station against the persons who accepted any amount from him.

The SDO in his reply submitted on dated 10.01.2012, stated that the connection was released in 12/1993. PDCO has been affected in 10/1996 due to defaulting amount and the consumer paid the whole defaulting amount in next two billing cycles. But meter was not brought from consumer premises by the Line Staff. On 16.03.2004, the consumer

deposited a fee of Rs.650/- vide BA-16 No. 90/21134 for MCO and the meter of the consumer has been changed. The copy of the MCO could not be traced out as the office premises has been changed and the records has been hotch-potched. The consumer gave an application on 19.08.2009, stating that his meter is running O.K. and his bills for the last four months are being received on average basis, be corrected on actual reading basis. After verification by the JE, Incharge, the bill of the petitioner was adjusted in 10/2009 vide SC&AR No.8/190, amounting to Rs.15816/-. But after adjustment of bill, he did not pay the bill till date and amount has been accumulated to the tune of Rs.30492/-. Thereafter, the bills are being raised and delivered on reading basis.

As per record, the bill to the petitioner during the month of 6/2009 was raised for Rs.160/- without mention of any defaulting amount. The connection of petitioner was not disconnected in the first instance, when the petitioner became defaulter and huge arrears accumulated. The MCO details not brought on records. The Forum has taken note of all facts but before the case is decided, the SDO concerned is given an opportunity to appear before the Forum to explain his viewpoint on the records and joint checking report of the Committee now brought out before the Forum.

The Nodal Officer was not present, the representative of the Nodal Officer was directed to convey the feelings of the Forum. The Nodal Officer is directed to ensure his presence as well as the presence of concerned SDO on the next date of hearing for submissions, so that the case is decided accordingly, which has already been over delayed.

To-day, the counsel of petitioner as well as the SDO was present. The SDO has stated that he has already furnished the reply of the petition. He further stated that as per request of the petitioner during the year 8/2009 regarding correction of his bill, the bill of the petitioner was adjusted/overhauled vide SC&AR No. 8/190 for Rs.15816/-. After adjustment of this bill, the consumer has not make any payment of the bill till-date, It is requested that the petitioner may kindly be advised to deposit the Nigam dues.

On the other hand, the counsel of petitioner stated that while ing the Committee, his client was not informed nor the committee contacted him personally. Moreover, the Forum has no authority to appoint a committee for checking at site. He stated that during 6/2009, his client had been given a bill amounting to Rs.160/- which he had paid on the due date. No arrear of any kind has been shown in the above said bill. If any amount was outstanding against his client prior to 6/2009, the same should have been mentioned/shown in the above said bill of Rs.160/-. His client is a BPL consumer and he may be given justice and all other benefits which are being given to the other BPL consumers. No action against the officials who had visited the premises of his client and taken money of Rs.12000/- had been taken. The counsel of petitioner further alleged that when the case is pending in the Forum, why the SDO is sending officials for disconnection of the premises of his client. He further alleged that if his client was not making payment of outstanding electricity bill, then the case should have been prepared under LRA (Land

Recovery Act), but the SDO had not dealt under the LRA. It means no amount was outstanding prior to 6/2009.

After hearing both the parties and taking note of all the records, this Forum has decided that:

- (i) The petitioner can be charged from maximum two years preceding to 6/2009 i.e. the date when the billing started. The account of the consumer may be overhauled slab-wise accordingly and corrected bill issued to the consumer within a month's time. The petitioner may be allowed to pay the amount of the bill in four installments keeping in view the period to which it pertains and his BPL status.
- (ii) The concerned Nigam officials in the Sub Division also erred while dealing with the consumer case. If the consumer was not making the payment of energy bills since 2004, the power supply should have been disconnected immediately after accumulation of three/four bills. But the Nigam officials had failed to perform their duties as per the instructions hence the balance amount if any, prior to 6/2007 after overhauling the consumer account is to be recovered from concerned officials held responsible for the same.
- (iii) The matter of alleged payment of Rs. 12,000/ and Rs. 1500/- by the consumer to the Nigam officials does not fall under the ambit of the Forum. However, the consumer can take appropriate legal action, if aggrieved in the matter.

The case is not to be proceeded further hence closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 532/2011**  
**Date of Institution:02.12.2011**  
**Date of Decision:21.02.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Suresh S/o Sh. Rattan Singh, R/o Near Balmiki Basti, Village, Ladwa, Distt., Hisar.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh.Nirmal Grover, Steno to N.O.	

**ORDER**

A petition of Sh. Suresh S/o Sh. Rattan Singh, R/o Village Ladwa, Distt., Hisar, was received through Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate, District Court, Hisar stating therein

1. that his client is having an electricity connection bearing A/C No. EEID-1319.
2. that there is no light in the premises of his client w.e.f. 1.04.2011 and meter burnt due to high voltage which is deficiency on the part of the respondent. The Nigam has been issuing false bills w.e.f. 4/2011 to 11/2011, totaling Rs.7700/-, the applicant is not liable to pay this amount. Photo copy of the latest false bill for the month of 11/2011 is attached as Annexure.
3. that the applicant is entitled for restoration of supply for which he had made representation to M.D./Respondent on 28.10.2011 under Registered cover (photo copy attached as Annexure) but in vain.

It is, therefore prayed that correct bill upto 31.3.2011 without surcharge may kindly be given and false bills w.e.f. 1.4.2011 till date may kindly be set aside and supply of the applicant be restored without any further delay.

On the other hand, the SDO was present and has submitted the reply of the petition stating therein that the complaint filed by the complainant through his counsel is utterly false, frivolous and vexatious only to eye wash the things. He further stated that since the date of release of connection, the complainant had not paid a single penny against the consumption bills. The present complaint is nothing but a misuse of process of law and had been filed with a fraudulent intention to create pressure upon the respondent so as to enjoy continue electricity without payment. He further stated that no representation had ever been received

by his office from the complainant as well as from the higher authorities as alleged by the counsel of petitioner.

It is, therefore, prayed that the complainant be given order to deposit the Nigam dues pending against him w.e.f. the release of connection. After hearing the SDO, the copy of reply of complaint was handed over to the counsel of petitioner for his further view point over the reply of the SDO.

The counsel of petitioner requested that he may be given time to study the reply of the SDO and he was allowed to appear on the next date of hearing, which is fixed for 13.02.2012.

To-day, the counsel of the petitioner was present. He stated that the reply furnished by the SDO is not based on facts. He further requested that keeping in view the condition of the petitioner, the case may kindly be settled and the connection of the petitioner be got released by taking the payment of the bill up to March, 2011.

After hearing the version of the SDO as well as the petitioner's counsel, this Forum directs to the SDO to release the connection of the petitioner after observing all usual formalities as per Nigam instructions and the outstanding amount be recovered from the date of actual power supply remained at the petitioner's premises after getting the enquiry of record done. The amount be recovered from the petitioner in three equal installments, after taking an affidavit that he will furnish the payment of pending dues/installment along with the current bill, failing which his connection be disconnected.

Since, the cause of action is over, the case is not to be proceed further and closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

Case No. 533/2011

Date of Institution: 09.12.2011

Date of decision : 20.12.2011.

In the matter of

**Sh. Krishan Kumar S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Village, Shahpur, P.O. Nangal Teju, Via Bawal, Distt., Rewari.**

V/s

DHBVN

Present on behalf of Applicant:

None.

Present on behalf of Respondent:

Sh. Raj Kumar, Nodal Officer

**ORDER**

A petition was received from Sh. Krishan Kumar S/o Sh. Banwari Lal, Village Shahpur, P.O. Nangal, Via Bawal, Distt., Rewari regarding billing on an average basis, although the meter of the petitioner is OK.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

Today, the representative of SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition along with the consumption data. He further stated that the bill of the petitioner has been rectified as per the consumption in the meter and requested for closer of the case. He also submitted an acknowledgement from the petitioner of having been redressed his grievances.

After going through the consumption data and the reply of SDO, there is no idea to precede the case further; hence the case is closed from this Forum. Moreover, the petitioner acknowledgement has also been submitted by the representative of SDO regarding Redressal of his grievance.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
Member

**(J.S.Kadian)**  
Member

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 534/2011**  
**Date of Institution:14.12.2011**  
**Date of Decision: 06.01.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Subhash Chander S/o Sh. Nand Lal, H.No.81/5, Mohalla Bhikhuwala,**  
**Inside Nagori Gate, Hisar.**

	<b>V/s</b>	<b>DHBVN</b>
Present on behalf of Applicant:	Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.	
Present on behalf of Respondent:	Sh.Nirmal Grover, Steno to N.O.	

**ORDER**

A petition of Sh. Subhash Chander, R/o Hisar was received through Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate, District Court, Hisar stating therein

1. that the petitioner is having an electric connection bearing A/C No. 0H11-N-501-0495. Bills for the month of April, June, 2008, amounting to Rs.315/- & Rs.322/- were paid on 2/5/2008 and 7/7/2008 respectively.
2. that the premises of the consumer was checked on 20.05.2008 by Sh. Sachin, JE and supply was disconnected at the spot on 20.05.2008. The consumer had challenged the said checking report before DCDRF, Hisar on 19.12.2008. As per the order of DCDRF, Hisar, the consumer had paid Rs.10728/-, but the supply had not been restored till to-day.
3. that bill for the month of August, 2008 of 205 units on average basis showing new reading "P" old reading 6136 and so on. The photo copy of the bill amounting to Rs.73750/- is attached.
4. that the respondent Nigam has been issuing false bills after 20-5-2008 till today i.e. November, 2011 whereas the supply already stands disconnected. The bill should have been stopped after disconnection of supply.

It is, therefore, requested that the said bills of the SDO may kindly be got corrected.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

To-day, the SDO was present and submitted the reply of the petition stating therein that the account of the consumer has been overhauled and an amount of Rs.8844/- is credited to the consumer account and requested for closer of the case. The copy of reply of the SDO was handed over to the counsel of the petitioner and

after seeing the same, he was satisfied with the amount credit to the consumer account.

Since, the cause of action is over, there is no idea to proceed the case further. Hence, the case is closed from this forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(R.V.Bari)**  
**Member**

**BEFORE THE CHAIRMAN**  
**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**  
**DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM**  
D-BLOCK, Ground Floor, Vidyut Sadan, Vidyut Nagar, Hisar-125 005  
(website: [www.dhbvn.com](http://www.dhbvn.com)) (e-mail ID: [cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com](mailto:cgrfdhbvn@gmail.com))

---

**Case No. 535/2011**  
**Date of Institution:15.12.2011**  
**Date of Decision :21.02.2012**

**In the matter of**  
**Sh. Smt. Murti Devi W/o Sh. Gulab Singh, Multan Nagar Colony, Near Govt. Senior Secondary School, Hansi, Distt., Hisar.**

**V/s**                      **DHBVN**

Present on behalf of Applicant:                      Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate.  
Present on behalf of Respondent:                      Sh.Nirmal Grover, Steno to N.O.

**ORDER**

A petition of Smt. Murti Devi, R/o Hansi was received through Sh. P.S.Saini, Advocate, District Court, Hisar, counsel of the petitioner stating therein

1. that the applicant had purchased a house where electricity connection was existing bearing A/C No. H31-MCiD-0018, in the name of Sh. Pyare Lal.
2. that the applicant has been availing the electricity services from the respondent and paying the bills and hence she is the consumer under the definition of consumer as per the HERC regulation. The meter of the consumer became defective at the old reading/new reading 5470 and the Nigam has been charging in excess of the consumed units. The Nigam did not send the bills regularly. However, some of the bills/receipts for the month of 10/2008 and 4/2009, which were paid are attached herewith, with reading old/new 5470.
3. that the defective meter has been replaced vide MCO No. 73/506 dated 28.06.2011 at the initial reading as 11089.
4. that the consumer has received bill for the month of 8/2011 showing current reading 11440 instead of 11089, with consumed units as 5970 in place of 351 units for Rs.49679/-. The complainant has deposited Rs.10,000/- on 14.09.2011, which is in excess over the consumption.

Accordingly, the petition of the petitioner was sent to the Nodal Officer for his viewpoint/reply.

During the proceedings held on 06.01.2012, the SDO was present and stated that he is not in a position to furnish the reply of the petition and requested for next date. His request granted.

To-day, the SDO was not present but a representative of his office was present. He submitted the reply of the petition vide his office memo No. 303/04 dated 25.01.2012 stating therein that while going through consumption data of

complainant bearing A/C No. H-31MC-ID/0018 in the name of Sh. Pyare Lal, it was observed that he was paying the electricity bills on average basis since many years in his own interest as the average billing was much less than that of his actual consumption. In the month of 12/2010, the computer raised the average bill. Due to increased in average amount, the consumer applied for change of meter and the meter was replaced by the Nigam with initial reading as 11089. While entering the particulars of MCO in the computer, the mistake occurred and the bill was raised to the petitioner for 5970 units wrongly. The representative of the SDO further stated that a mistake is committed on their part and the bill will be overhauled on the basis of the consumption in the new meter after running three cycle consumption.

On the other hand, the counsel of petitioner was present and he was apprised of the mistakes committed by the SDO office and that the bill will be got overhauled by the SDO after three cycle consumption. He was satisfied with the statement of representative of SDO office and with the reply of SDO.

Since, the cause of action is over, the case is not to be proceed further and closed from this Forum.

Given under my hand.

The case is closed from this Forum.

File be consigned to record.

**(K.K.Gupta)**  
**Member**

**(Rajesh Sharma)**  
**Member**