

Delhi Electricity Regulatory Commission

Viniyamak Bhawan, 'C' Block, Shivalik, Malviya Nagar, New Delhi- 110017

F.11 (1438)/DERC/2016-17

Petition No. 56/2016

Under section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003

In the matter of:

Shri Jatin Mittal
S/o Late Shri Ram Dhari Mittal,
535-B/6, Govind Puri, Kalkaji,
New Delhi – 110019

.....**Complainant**

VERSUS

BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd.
Through its: **CEO**
BSES Bhawan
Nehru Place
New Delhi-110019

.....**Respondent**

Coram: Sh. B.P. Singh, Member

Appearance:

1. Advocate of the Petitioner;
2. Shri S. Bhattacharya, GM Enforcement, BRPL.
3. Shri Ritu Raj Sinha, DGM Enforcement, BRPL;
4. Shri Manish Srivastava, Advocate for Respondent;
5. Shri Aditya Gupta, Advocate for Respondent;
6. Shri Shagun Trisal, Advocate for Respondent;
7. Shri Aruj Mathur, Manager (Legal), BRPL;

INTERIM ORDER

(Date of Hearing: 25.10.2017)

(Date of Order: 03.11.2017)

1. The instant petition has been filed by Shri Jatin Mittal, under Section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003 against BSES Rajdhani Power Ltd. for violation of the procedure as laid down in Regulations of the Delhi Electricity Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2007.
2. The matter was heard on 25.10.2017. The Counsel for the Petitioner reiterated its submissions made in the Petition.
3. The Counsel for the Respondent submitted that on the same matter the Petitioner had approached the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi and in pursuance to the Order dated 29.07.2016 of the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi the Respondent has already afforded a personal hearing to the Petitioner. Thereafter, the final Assessment bill dated 16.08.2016 was issued. As the matter has already been disposed of by the Hon'ble High Court of Delhi, the instant Petition may be dismissed.

4. The Counsel for the Petitioner rebutted that the present petition is not filed against the Assessment Bill but it is filed for violation of the provisions of Electricity Act, 2003 and related regulations by the Respondent while booking a case against the Petitioner.
5. It is observed that the sequence of events and facts as narrated by the Petitioner are not clearly reflected in the Petition. The Petitioner is directed to furnish a revised Petition with detailed brief of the sequence of events within two weeks with a copy served upon the Respondent.
6. The matter was adjourned. The next date of hearing shall be intimated to the parties in due course.
7. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
(B. P. Singh)
Member