

Office of the Electricity Ombudsman

(A Statutory Body of Govt. of NCT of Delhi under the Electricity Act, 2003)

B-53, Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi – 110 057

(Phone No.: 32506011, Fax No.26141205)

Appeal No. F. ELECT/Ombudsman/2014/604

Appeal against the Order dated 30.10.2013 passed by CGRF–BYPL in Complaint No.207/09/13.

In the matter of:

Shri Jalaluddin - Appellant

Versus

M/s BSES- Yamuna Power Ltd. - Respondent

Present:-

Appellant: Shri Jalaluddin was not present.

Respondent: Shri Raghvender Sharma, AFO, attended on behalf of the BYPL.

Date of Hearing: 25.03.2014

Date of Order : 26.03.2014

ORDER NO. OMBUDSMAN/2014/604

One Shri Jalaluddin filed a complaint/appeal against the order of the CGRF dated 30.10.2013 dismissing his petition for release of a connection at premises with the address F-2320, Gali No.23/3, Chand Bagh, Karawal Nagar, Delhi - 110094 on the ground that legal cases for recovery of direct theft dues were pending on the same premises where the domestic connection had been sought and hence the CGRF had no jurisdiction in the matter.



35

This order was challenged in this office on the ground that the CGRF was wrong in holding it had no jurisdiction as his commercial connection had no cases pending against it in any court or authority and that he has been paying the bills regularly. Most of the other facts in his petition are the ones that he had raised before the CGRF and these have been fully addressed in that Forum. It is a fact that there are a number of direct theft notices issued in the same premises against the name of Sunehara Begum. These are pending in the Special Court for many years from 2005/2006 onwards.

On the date of hearing, the Complainant was absent and conveyed a telephonic message 15 minutes before the time of scheduled hearing that he would not be able to be present. No earlier intimation was sent. The DISCOM was present and clarified that many direct theft cases are pending since 2005. It is not correct of the Complainant to state that no cases are pending. If there is any confusion/dispute as to the person/identity of the consumer against whom direct theft cases have been registered, this can be resolved in the hearing in Special Court. As the matter is one of direct theft, as has been correctly brought out by the CGRF, this office is not in a position to go further into the case.

The appeal is dismissed and the case is closed.


(PRADEEP SINGH)
Ombudsman

26th March, 2014