



# Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum

FOR BSES YAMUNA POWER LIMITED

(Constituted under section 42 (5) of Indian Electricity Act. 2003)  
Sub-Station Building BSES (YPL) Regd. Office Karkardooma,  
Shahdara, Delhi-110032

Phone: 32978140 Fax: 22384886

E-mail:cgrfbyp@hotmai.com

SECY/CHN 015/08NKS

## C A No. Applied for Complaint No. 208/2022

### In the matter of:

Sikandar Singh .....Complainant

### VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Limited .....Respondent

### Quorum:

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

### Appearance:

1. Mr. Sikandar Singh, Complainant
2. Mr. Imran Siddiqi, Ms. Ritu Gupta, Ms. Shweta Chaudhary, Mr. Vijay Rana & Ms. Divya Sharma, On behalf of BYPL

### ORDER

Date of Hearing: 13<sup>th</sup> December, 2022

Date of Order: 23<sup>rd</sup> December, 2022

### Order Pronounced By:- Mr. Nishat Ahmed Alvi, Member (CRM)

1. This complaint has been filed by Mr. Sikandar Singh, against BYPL-LNR.
2. The brief facts of the case giving rise to this grievance are that complainant Mr. Sikandar Singh is using electricity through CA NO. 153005578 and the bill for the month of August 2021 he received was for Rs. 27810/- which he complained of to the office of respondent.

*Sikandar Singh*

Complaint No. 208/2022

Thereafter, respondent replaced his electricity meter and get it tested in lab. The lab report stated as meter faulty, but respondent did not revise his bill and force him to make payment of the bill. He did not pay the bill and respondent disconnected his electricity supply on non-payment of electricity bill.

3. The respondent in reply briefly stated that the complainant raised billing dispute in particular in respect of bill dated 25.09.21 against CA No. 153005578. The bill dated 25.09.2021 was raised for the period of 21.08.2021 to 25.09.2021 on the basis of downloaded reading for 2955 units for an amount of Rs. 27810/-.

OP further submitted that it is a downloaded bill wherein due benefit of proper slab has been given. There is no discrepancy in the bill and duly paid by the complainant. The meter of the complainant was changed on 08.02.2022 under category non-downloaded as meter could not be downloaded, for the period of 27.01.2022 to 08.02.2022; therefore for that period system generated bill was raised for 82 units only taking into consideration readings of corresponding period of last year.

4. Heard both the parties and perused the record.
5. Heard the arguments of Authorized Representative of the complainant and OP-BYPL. Representative of the complainant submitted that the meter installed at his premises was dead and the bill for the period 21.08.2021 to 25.09.2021 was unjustified and biased. He also stated that bill prior to this period and after this period is correct. The meter in the said period became defective and this bill needs to be rectified.

*Shashi by SP*

Complaint No. 208/2022

6. In this record, LR of OP submitted that the bills of the complainant are being raised as per the downloaded readings and the period which the complainant is disputing is also of downloaded period. The meter of the complainant was tested in independent lab on 22.02.2022 and was found dead, but the bill the complainant is disputing, is for the period from 21.08.2021 to 25.09.2021, thereafter the meter was at site and recorded regular actual downloaded readings.
7. Thus, the correctness of the disputed bill can be ascertained on proof of the fact that as to whether the meter was dead at the particular time or later on found dead.
8. From the perusal of evidence placed on record we are of considered opinion that since the readings are downloaded and if there would have been any deficiency in the meter same would have reflected while downloading the meter reading, hence, the contention of the complainant that the meter became faulty for only one month does not substantiate here. How electric meters can became faulty in one month and thereafter automatically its functioning became in order.
9. Therefore, we are of considered opinion that the bill raised by the OP is in order and payable by the complainant.

*Sachin M. G. W.*

Complaint No. 208/2022

ORDER

The complaint is rejected. OP is directed to waive off entire LPSC levied in the bill of the complainant and to facilitate the complainant more if he wants; respondent is also directed to allow him instalments as per DERC Guidelines 2017.

The OP is also directed to file compliance report to this office within 21 days from the release of this order.

**The case is disposed off as above.**

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

Proceedings closed.

  
(NISHAT A. ALVI)  
MEMBER (CRM)

  
(P.K. AGRAWAL)  
MEMBER (LEGAL)

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

  
(P.K. SINGH)  
CHAIRMAN