



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 0124-2971798  
website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)

CASE NUMBER	DH / CGRF / 3790 / 2021
DATE OF INSTITUTION	01.10.2021
DATES OF HEARING	11.02.2022, 15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES, DHBVN**

Present:

SANJEEV KUMAR CHOPRA	CHAIRPERSON
SUSHILA KUMARI	MEMBER ACCOUNTS (VC)
RAJ KUMAR	MEMBER TECHNICAL

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Mahabir Singh Chauhan, House no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal regarding wrong billing

..... Complainant / Petitioner

Vs.

XEN/Operation Divn., DHBVN, Jind  
SDO/Operation S/U Sub Divn. No.1, DHBVN, Jind

..... Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant

Representative

For Respondent

Representative of respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

Sh. Mahabir Singh Chauhan, House no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal is consumer of DHBVN bearing account no. J12MT900021F under SDO (OP)S/U S/Divn. No.1, DHBVN, Jind. The Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant filed the present complaint stating that they had been charged Rs. 8840/- in 12/2019, Rs. 53582/- in 02/2020, Rs. 30000/- in 09/2020, Rs. 62280/- in 11/2020, fixed charges Rs. 31680/- in 11/2020 and levy of the fixed charges in the bill since 2017 from the one time exceeding of the MDI is illegal and wrong. The charges so debited and recovered may be refunded back. On constant persuasion with the SDO no correct information/reply has been given by the SDO respondent. He has requested the forum to redress his complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 11.02.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The major issues raised by him were:

1. That the meter installed is not of auto reset type. This can be seen from the MT-1 report where the meter reset count has not increased. And when the meter is not of auto reset type, then how the MDI penalty is being levied month after month without manually resetting it.
2. That MDI penalty has been levied in many months where the MDI even though exceeded remained within the 10% limit and there is no penalty leviable if the MDI does not exceed 10% of the sanctioned load.
3. That in many bills, the bills have been generated on kVAh basis by dividing the kWh reading by 0.9 whereas the actual kVAh reading was available. He submitted that they have been maintaining power factor as

good as 0.98 / 0.99 then why the factor of 0.9 is being applied.

4. That even the readings are not being taken regularly by the subdivision and arbitrary readings have been filled in thereby causing wrong bills

The SDO submitted that so far as in his knowledge, the meter was auto reset. But since the meter reset count has not increased, he would ask for a report from the M&P wing on the whole issue. SDO requested for another date for submission of complete facts of the case. The Forum directed SDO to look at the issues of complaint comprehensively and to submit the reply in one go. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 2325 dated 13.07.2022 stating that the meter installed at complainant's site was auto-reset type. But the question of complainant remained unanswered that if the meter was auto reset type, then why the MDI reset counter did not move forward. The SDO also placed on record a letter written to XEN M&P seeking the clarification in that regard again. Also, the SDO submitted in his reply that the MDI penalty so far has been levied only in the cases where it had exceeded the permissible limit of 10% and no where else. Also, that the complainant was now being billed on kVAh basis at MF of 20 but it is so only after the complainant increased the load from 18 kW to 26 kW. That till such time the load was below 20 kW, the billing was done on kWh only and not on kVAh. The Forum asked the complainant to go through the reply submitted by SDO and raise the objection, if any, or anything else which he wanted to submit. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well

as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The major issues raised by him were:

1. That the meter installed is not of auto reset type. This can be seen from the MT-1 report where the meter reset count has not increased. And when the meter is not of auto reset type, then how the MDI penalty is being levied month after month without manually resetting it.
2. That MDI penalty has been levied in many months where the MDI even though exceeded remained within the 10% limit and there is no penalty leviable if the MDI does not exceed 10% of the sanctioned load.
3. That in many bills, the bills have been generated on kVAh basis by dividing the kWh reading by 0.9 whereas the actual kVAh reading was available. He submitted that they have been maintaining power factor as good as 0.98 / 0.99 then why the factor of 0.9 is being applied.
4. That even the readings are not being taken regularly by the subdivision and

arbitrary readings have been filled in thereby causing wrong bills

The Forum directed subdivision to take up the matter personally regarding auto reset facility and also to see from records regarding the matter of wrong power factor applied and the levy of MDI penalty even when it did not exceed 10% limit. The SDO assured that he would take up the matter personally with M&P Hisar and submit a comprehensive reply by the next date of hearing. The Forum directed subdivision to submit detailed reply by 10<sup>th</sup> of October 2022 with a copy to the complainant so that arguments can be held and matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 through video call. The complainant as well as SDO were present through phone. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 3229 dated 14.10.2022 stating:

- i) That the meter during the period of dispute was not auto-reset type but because the MDI recorded every month was different and exceeded the limit, the MDI penalty charged was correct
- ii) There is no instance when MDI penalty has charged for a MDI lesser than 10% exceed limit
- iii) Power factor of 0.9 has been correctly applied
- iv) Readings are being taken through CMRI by the outsourced agency

The complainant on his side disputed the reply of the subdivision stating that when the meter did not have reset facility and also when it was not reset manually, then how the MDI shown in monthly readings could differ. It shows that readings were taken arbitrarily without going to site. Also, that when the actual reading in kVAH was

available, then why the factor of 0.9 has been applied in the bills. He also argued that in many bills, the MDI penalty has been levied despite the fact that the MDI did not exceed the permissible limit of 10% and that it was evident from the details attached along with his complaint.

The Forum directed SDO to look into the objections raised by the complainant and submit reply by the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
**Member Technical**

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
**Member Accounts**

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
**Chairperson**



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 01242971798**

(website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in)) (e-mail ID: [cgrf@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in))

Case No. DH/CGRF-	4037/2022
Date of Institution:	08.03.2022
Date of Hearing:	15.03.2022, 15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSING OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**

Present:

Sanjeev Kumar Chopra	Chairperson
Sushila Kumari	Member Accounts (VC)
Raj Kumar	Member Technical

In the matter of complaint of MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. MandiKalan, Uchana, Distt.  
Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Narwana  
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Uchana

.....Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of Respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. MandiKalan, Uchana, Distt. Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal has an electricity connection bearing account no. J34-TC-90/0044/7716361000 under SDO (OP) S/Divn.,DHBN, No. Uchana. Hence, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that a sum of Rs. 46560/- is debited in their account and billed on 12/08/2021 without issuing Show Cause Notice to them and without affording any opportunity to contest the demand of Rs. 46560/-. The notice memo no. 10/HM dated 07/01/2021 for Rs. 46560/- is stated to have been issued to them is only provided after the debit of the amount and through their RTI application dated 25/10/2021 and was without the details. The bill so issued on 12/08/2021 for Rs. 88620/- is also wrong. They have requested the Forum to redress their complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.03.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The complainant submitted that after extension of load, CT meter was installed in place of whole current meter but the same was not updated in the system which caused wrong billing. Also, the Multiplying Factor has not been applied correctly even after up-dation of the CT meter in the billing system. The SDO was directed to submit his reply on the issues raised in the complaint as well as during the hearing. The SDO requested for another date for filing the facts and detailed reply on the matter. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no.



977 dated 20.06.2022 stating that the issues raised by the complainant were not correct and therefore no correction was required. Copy of the reply is sent to complainant for further submission and for raising objections, if any, by the next date of hearing for detailed arguments. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The Forum asked the SDO to submit parawise reply especially regarding change of MF from time to time. The Forum further directed SDO to submit details on an excel sheet along with copy to the complainant so that the correct charging can be arrived at. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 08/CGRF-4037 dated 14.10.2022 stating that the charges levied against the complainant's account was correct. That the MF was actually

10 whereas the billing had been done on a MF of 6. Since the MDI exceed and also the fixed charges were to be levied, the penalty charged on account of MDI and fixed charges was correct. The Forum supplied copy of this reply to the complainant and asked him to file his submissions, if any, by the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
**Member Technical**

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
**Member Accounts**

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
**Chairperson**



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 01242971798**

(website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in)) (e-mail ID: [cgrf@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in))

Case No. DH/CGRF-	4042/2022
Date of Institution:	14.03.2022
Date of Hearing:	15.03.2022, 15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSING OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**

Present:

Sanjeev Kumar Chopra	Chairperson
Sushila Kumari	Member Accounts (VC)
Raj Kumar	Member Technical

In the matter of complaint of MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. Kasoon, Uchana, Distt.  
Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Narwana  
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Uchana

.....Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of Respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. MandiKalan, Uchana, Distt. Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal has an electricity connection bearing account no. J34-TC-90-0070/5534261000 under SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, No. Uchana. Hence, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that their connection was released on 30/03/2017. The meter reading was not recorded till 01/2020 and provisional bills were being issued. The account no. was changed, but the reading was again not recorded and the inflated bills were issued. They have requested the respondent SDO to issue the bill on the basis of actual recorded consumption and withdraw the inflated bills alongwith surcharge, but no action has been taken till date to resolve their grievances. They have requested the Forum to redress their complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.03.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The complainant submitted that bills raised were not as per reading and the system had been generating bills on average basis. The SDO was directed to submit his reply on the issues raised in the complaint as well as during the hearing. The SDO requested for another date for filing the facts and detailed reply on the matter. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 975 dated 20.06.2022 stating that the issues raised by the complainant had been looked into and it was found that an amount of Rs. 26432/- was adjustable /

refundable. Copy of the reply is sent to complainant for further submission and for raising objections, if any, by the next date of hearing for detailed arguments. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The Forum observed that the matter remains pending because SDO has not been submitting para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant. The Forum again directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 12.10.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 07/CGRF/4042 dated 14.10.2022 stating that bill has now been prepared as per reading and a refund of Rs. 26432/- has been calculated. He also submitted the calculation sheet showing details of the proposed refund.

Also, that this refund would get reflected in the next billing cycle. The Forum supplied copy of the reply to the complainant asking him to make his submissions, if any, by the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
Member Technical

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
Member Accounts

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
Chairperson



**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 01242971798**

(website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in)) (e-mail ID: [cgrf@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in))

Case No. DH/CGRF-	4111/2022
Date of Institution:	05.04.2022
Date of Hearing:	15.04.2022, 15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSING OF CONSUMR GRIEVANCES**

Present:

Sanjeev Kumar Chopra	Chairperson
Sushila Kumari	Member Accounts (VC)
Raj Kumar	Member Technical

In the matter of complaint of MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. Uchana, Distt. Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Narwana  
SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, Uchana

.....Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of Respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

MS Indus Towers Ltd., Vill. Uchana, Distt. Jind, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram, Karnal has an electricity connection bearing account no. J34-TC-90/0043 under SDO (OP) S/Divn., DHBVN, No. Uchana. Hence, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that a sum of Rs. 147897/- is debited in their account and billed on 12/08/2021 without issuing Show Cause Notice to them and without affording any opportunity to contest the demand of Rs. 147897/-. The 4 no. half margins were stated to have been issued due to extension of load. But the details of the same have been provided only after debiting of the amount and through their RTI application dated 25/10/2021 and requested for correct MF be entered in billing records to avoid half margins. They have requested the Forum to redress their complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.04.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The complainant submitted that after extension of load, CT meter was installed in place of whole current meter but the same was not updated in the system which caused wrong billing. Also, the Multiplying Factor has not been applied correctly even after up-dation of the CT meter in the billing system. The SDO was directed to submit his reply on the issues raised in the complaint as well as during the hearing. The SDO requested for another date for filing the facts and detailed reply on the matter. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant as well as the SDO were present through video call. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no.



976 dated 20.06.2022 stating that the issues raised by the complainant had been looked into and it was found that an amount of Rs. 31680/- is adjustable / refundable. Copy of the reply is sent to complainant for further submission and for raising objections, if any, by the next date of hearing for detailed arguments. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The Forum observed that the matter remains pending because SDO has not been submitting para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant. The Forum again directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 12.10.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 at Jind. The SDO was present in person but the complainant was present through video call. The SDO submitted para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant vide memo no. 08/CGRF-

4111 dated 14.10.2022. Copy of this reply was sent to complainant and he was asked to make his submissions, if any, by the next date of hearing. The SDO in his reply stated that the charges levied against the complainant's account was correct. That the MF was actually 10 whereas the billing had been done on a MF of 6. Since the MDI exceed and also the fixed charges were to be levied, the penalty charged on account of MDI and fixed charges was correct. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
**Member Technical**

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
**Member Accounts**

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
**Chairperson**



FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 01242971798  
(website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in)) (e-mail ID:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in)

Case No. DH/CGRF-	3788/2021
Date of Institution:	01/10/2021
Date of Hearing:	15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSING OF CONSUMR GRIEVANCES**

Present:

Sanjeev Kumar Chopra	Chairperson
Sushila Kumari	Member Accounts (VC)
Raj Kumar	Member Technical

In the matter of complaint of M/S Indus Towers Ltd at Vita Milk Plant, H.no. 58/4,  
R.K. Puram Karnal.

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn.,DHBVN,Jind  
SDO (OP)S/U S/Divn., DHBVN, No. I

.....Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of Respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

M/S Indus Towers Ltd at Vita Milk Plant, H.no. 58/4, R.K. Puram Karnalhas an electricity connection bearing account no. J12MT900013H / 6678910000 under SDO (OP) S/Divn.,DHBVN, No. I. Hence, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that they have been assessed Rs. 25900/- and Rs. 13200/- vide half margin no. 045 and 046/71/2017 dated 19/01/2018, Rs. 44160/-vide half margin no. 21/59/2018 dated 27/08/2018, Rs. 25500/-vide half margin no. 87/98/2019 and Rs. 39298/- vide half margin no. 98/93/2019 dated 09/12/2019 which is incorrect and in violations of the HERC Regulations. Further the MDI reading was not reset even once in last 2½ year till 12/2020 when the meter was replaced on the sanction of the extension of the load applied by them. They have requested the Forum to redress their complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.06.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The major issues raised by him were:

1. That the meter installed is not of auto reset type. This can be seen from the MT-1 report where the meter reset count has not increased. And when the meter is not of auto reset type, then how the MDI penalty is being levied month after month without manually resetting it.
2. That MDI penalty has been levied in many months where the MDI even

though exceeded remained within the 10% limit and there is no penalty leviable if the MDI does not exceed 10% of the sanctioned load.

3. That in many bills, the bills have been generated on kVAh basis by dividing the kWh reading by 0.9 whereas the actual kVAh reading was available. He submitted that they have been maintaining power factor as good as 0.98 / 0.99 then why the factor of 0.9 is being applied.
4. That even the readings are not being taken regularly by the subdivision and arbitrary readings have been filled in thereby causing wrong bills

The SDO submitted that so far as in his knowledge, the meter was auto reset. But since the meter reset count has not increased, he would ask for a report from the M&P wing on the whole issue. SDO requested for another date for submission of complete facts of the case. The Forum directed SDO to look at the issues of complaint comprehensively and to submit the reply in one go. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 2324 dated 13.07.2022 stating that the meter installed at complainant's site was auto-reset type. But the question of complainant remained unanswered that if the meter was auto reset type, then why the MDI reset counter did not move forward. The SDO also placed on record a letter written to XEN M&P seeking the clarification in that regard again. Also, the SDO submitted in his reply that the MDI penalty so far has been levied only in the cases where it had exceeded the permissible limit of 10% and nowhere else. Also, that the complainant was now being billed on kVAh basis at MF of 20 but it is so only after the complainant increased the load from 18 kW to 26 kW.

That till such time the load was below 20 kW, the billing was done on kWh only and not on kVAh. The Forum asked the complainant to go through the reply submitted by SDO and raise the objection, if any, or anything else which he wanted to submit. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the same issues which he has stated at length in his complaint. The major issues raised by him were:

1. That the meter installed is not of auto reset type. This can be seen from the MT-1 report where the meter reset count has not increased. And when the meter is not of auto reset type, then how the MDI penalty is being levied month after month without manually resetting it.
2. That MDI penalty has been levied in many months where the MDI even though exceeded remained within the 10% limit and there is no penalty leviable if the MDI does not exceed 10% of the sanctioned load.

3. That in many bills, the bills have been generated on kVAh basis by dividing the kWh reading by 0.9 whereas the actual kVAh reading was available. He submitted that they have been maintaining power factor as good as 0.98 / 0.99 then why the factor of 0.9 is being applied.
4. That even the readings are not being taken regularly by the subdivision and arbitrary readings have been filled in thereby causing wrong bills

The Forum directed subdivision to take up the matter personally regarding auto reset facility and also to see from records regarding the matter of wrong power factor applied and the levy of MDI penalty even when it did not exceed 10% limit. The SDO assured that he would take up the matter personally with M&P Hisar and submit a comprehensive reply by the next date of hearing. The Forum directed subdivision to submit detailed reply by 10<sup>th</sup> of October 2022 with a copy to the complainant so that arguments can be held and matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 through video call. The complainant as well as SDO were present through phone. The SDO submitted reply vide memo no. 3229 dated 14.10.2022 stating:

- v) That the meter during the period of dispute was not auto-reset type but because the MDI recorded every month was different and exceeded the limit, the MDI penalty charged was correct
- vi) There is no instance when MDI penalty has charged for a MDI lesser than 10% exceed limit
- vii) Power factor of 0.9 has been correctly applied
- viii) Readings are being taken through CMRI by the outsourced agency

The complainant on his side disputed the reply of the subdivision stating that when the meter did not have reset facility and also when it was not reset manually, then how the MDI shown in monthly readings could differ. It shows that readings were taken arbitrarily without going to site. Also, that when the actual reading in kVAH was available, then why the factor of 0.9 has been applied in the bills. He also argued that in many bills, the MDI penalty has been levied despite the fact that the MDI did not exceed the permissible limit of 10% and that it was evident from the details attached along with his complaint.

The Forum directed SDO to look into the objections raised by the complainant and submit reply by the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
Member Technical

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
Member Accounts

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
Chairperson





**FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES  
DAKSHIN HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM  
HETRI, SECTOR 16, IDC AREA, GURUGRAM  
Telephone No. 01242971798**

(website: [www.dhbvn.org.in](http://www.dhbvn.org.in)) (e-mail ID: [cgrf@dhbvn.org.in](mailto:cgrf@dhbvn.org.in))

Case No. DH/CGRF-	3789/2021
Date of Institution:	01/10/2021
Date of Hearing:	15.06.2022, 14.07.2022, 17.08.2022, 16.09.2022, 17.10.2022

**BEFORE THE  
FORUM FOR REDRESSING OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES**

Present:

Sanjeev Kumar Chopra	Chairperson
Sushila Kumari	Member Accounts (VC)
Raj Kumar	Member Technical

In the matter of complaint of M/S Indus Towers Ltd, New Anaj Mandi, Jind

.....Complainant/Petitioner

V/s

XEN (OP) Divn., DHBVN, Jind  
SDO (OP) S/U S/Divn., DHBVN, No. II

.....Respondents

Appearance:

For Complainant: Representative

For the Respondent: Representative of Respondent SDO

## **INTERIM ORDER**

M/S Indus Towers Ltd, New Anaj Mandi, Jind has an electricity connection bearing account no. 0643441511 under SDO (OP) S/Divn.,DHBVN, No. II. Hence, this Forum has jurisdiction to hear the complaint.

Complainant has filed the present complaint stating that they have been charged Rs. 142593/- due to wrong assessment in 11/2020 due to meter found defective from 04/12/2018 to 09/01/2020. They have requested for refund of assessment amount after following the prescribed HERC Regulations 29/2014. They have requested the Forum to redress their complaint.

The complaint was forwarded to the Nodal Officer for filing the written reply of the Nigam and both the parties were asked to appear before the Forum on 15.06.2022 at Jind for hearing of the case.

Proceedings were held on 15.06.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The complainant again reiterated the issues which he has raised in his complaint. The major issues raised by him were:

1. That penalty for slowness of meter after it is detected can be charged for not more than 6 months whereas the subdivision has imposed penalty for a period of last one year.
2. That in case the date of slowness or the date of meter having gone defective can be established, then the penalty can be imposed only for the period of such defectiveness.
3. That in the instant case, the M&P report itself shows that the meter became defective 106 days back from the date of checking

and therefore the penalty cannot be levied for more than the established period.

The SDO requested for another date for submission of complete facts of the case. The Forum directed SDO to look at the issues of complaint comprehensively and to submit the reply in one go. Now to come up for hearing on 14.07.2022.

Proceedings were held on 14.07.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call whereas the SDO was present in person. The SDO submitted his reply vide memo no. 976 dated 04.07.2022 wherein he has stated that after making all corrections, an amount of Rs. 46668/- has been found refundable. The Forum directed SDO to send a copy of this reply and detailed calculation of Rs. 46668/- to the complainant so that he can raise objections, if any, and detailed arguments can be held on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 17.08.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.08.2022 through video call. The SDO as well as complainant were present through video call. The Forum asked the complainant whether he wanted to submit anything on the SDO's reply submitted last time. The complainant argued that since the beginning, he has been demanding a parawise reply to all the issues raised by him in the complainant but so far, the parawise reply has not been submitted by the SDO. Therefore, the matter remains pending because he is not able to argue unless he gets parawise reply. The Forum observed that SDO should submit para wise reply to the issues raised by the complainant in one go so that matter can be argued and concluded. The Forum directed the SDO to submit parawise reply and send it to the complainant also latest by 10.09.2022 so

that matter can be concluded on the next date of hearing. Now to come up for hearing on 16.09.2022.

Proceedings were held on 16.09.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call but the SDO was present in person. The SDO submitted that he had correctly charged the penalty and no correction was required. The Forum observed that on one hand, the complainant had intimated the defective period even up to the minutes whereas the SDO on the other hand had not gone into the detailed analysis submitted by the complainant along with complaint itself. The SDO requested for another date so that he can personally go through the M&P checking data and find out correctness of the defective period informed by the complainant. The Forum advised SDO to go personally to M&P to check up facts and submit a detailed report by the next date of hearing with a copy to the complainant. Now to come up for hearing on 17.10.2022.

Proceedings were held on 17.10.2022 at Jind. Complainant was present through video call but the SDO was present in person. The SDO submitted that he had correctly charged the penalty and no correction was required. The Forum again advised SDO to go personally to M&P to check up facts and submit a detailed report by the next date of hearing with a copy to the complainant. Now to come up for hearing on 11.11.2022.

**(RAJ KUMAR)**  
**Member Technical**

**(SUSHILA KUMARI)**  
**Member Accounts**

**(SANJEEV CHOPRA)**  
**Chairperson**