



C A No. 153730008
Complaint No. 342/2024

In the matter of:

Neeraj Kumar

.....Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Limited

.....Respondent

Quorum:

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

Appearance:

1. Mr. Neeraj Kumar Counsel of the complainant
2. Ms. Kavya, Mr. R.S. Bisht, Ms. Chhavi Rani & Mr. Akshat Aggarwal on behalf of respondent

ORDER

Date of Hearing: 1st October, 2024

Date of Order: 18th October, 2024

Order Pronounced By: - Mr. S.R. Khan, Member (Technical)

1. The brief facts of the case giving rise to this grievance is for revision of bill along with compensation for CA No. 153730008 installed at premises no. 217, 1st floor, Old No.-6, Shankar Marg, Mandawali, Delhi-110092. Complainant stated that he consumed 382 units in 29 days from April to May 2024 and the complainant has not been granted benefit of subsidy as per tariff structure. Therefore, he requested the Forum to direct the respondent for bill revision CA No. 153730008 along with compensation.

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. 342/2024

2. The respondent in reply briefly stated that by the way of present complaint it is claimed by the complainant that he has not been provided with the subsidy in respect of bill dated 24.05.2024.

The factual matrix of the case is as under;

- i. Complainant is a registered consumer of respondent assigned with CA No. 153730008 under tariff category domestic. Complainant received bill dated 24.05.2024 of 382 units for 29 days wherein no subsidy is provided.
- ii. Complainant questioned the same vide mail dated 25.05.2024 and sought revision of bill by providing sought subsidy. OP replied to the said mail vide mail dated 05.06.2024 explaining for same.

Reasons as to why complainant is not entitled to subsidy are as under;

- i. Bill dated 24.05.2024 was generated for the period of 29 days i.e. from 23.04.2024 to 21.05.2024. Thus total units used in the month of April are for 8 days i.e. from 23.04.2024 to 30.04.2024. The balance 21 days are of month May.
- ii. As for 29 days total units consumed are 382 thus for 8 days units consumed are taken 105.37 units which are calculated as under:-
$$382/29 \times 8 = 105.37$$

Accordingly, the balance units of 276.63 are taken for the month of May.
- iii. For the month of April, subsidy under first slab (200 units) is for 53.33 units calculation whereof is as under:
$$200/30 \times 8 = 53.33$$
- iv. Likewise in the month of April subsidy under second slab 200 is of 52.04 units, calculation whereof is as under:
Total units i.e. 105.37
First slab i.e. 53.33
Second Slab i.e. 52.05

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. 342/2024

v. Slab calculation for 21 days as under:-

First Slab: $200/31 \times 21 = 135.48$

Second Slab: $400/31 \times 21 = 270.96$

vi. Thus subsidy for 29 days or to say for the bill dated 24.04.2024 would be applicable.

Under first slab for $53.33 + 135.48 = 188.89 = 189$

Units (rounded off)

Under second slab for $52.04 + 135 = 187$

Units (rounded off)

The complainant would have received the benefit of subsidy under second slab had there been consumption of used 376 units for 29 days for the period 23.04.2024 to 21.05.2024. As consumer consumption is of 382 units extra as such complainant is not entitled to any subsidy.

3. Counsel for the complainant in its rejoinder refuted the contentions of the respondent as averred in their reply and submitted that all the calculations of CA No. 153730008 raise by the respondent are false and fabricated. Complainant further stated that his family members were gone to hometown in summer vacation in the month of May and June 2024.

The complainant's connection was energized on dated 24.03.2022 hence; the bill is not been properly calculated by OP for the period 22.04.2024 to 21.05.2024. It is pertinent to mention that the bill is raised for only 29 days instead of 30/31 days. The current bill of the complainant is calculated for 31 days from June 2024 till July 2024.

4. Heard arguments of both the parties.

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)

Complaint No. 342/2024

5. During the course of arguments, OP apprised the complainant and the Forum in details regarding the calculations of the bills raised to the complainant. OP stated that the bills raised by OP are calculated on the basis of per day consumption and not the monthly consumption basis, thus the bill raised by OP is correct and payable by the complainant.
6. In view of the above, we are of considered opinion that bill raised by OP is correct and payable by the complainant.

ORDER

The bill raised by OP is correct and payable by the complainant. OP is directed to waive off entire LPSC from the bill of the complainant.

This Order shall be complied with within 21 days of the receipt of the certified copy or from the date it is uploaded on the Website of the Forum; whichever is earlier.

The parties are hereby informed that the instant Order is appealable by the Consumer before the Ombudsman within 30 days of the receipt of the Order.

If the Orders are not appealed against within the stipulated time or no interim stay thereon has been granted by the Ombudsman, the same shall be deemed to have attained finality.

Any contravention of these Orders is punishable under Section 142 of the Electricity Act 2003.

(NISHAT A ALVI)
MEMBER (CRM)

(P.K. AGRAWAL)
MEMBER (LEGAL)

(S.R. KHAN)
MEMBER (TECH.)

(P.K. SINGH)
CHAIRMAN

4 of 4

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)