C G R F
B Y P L

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
FOR BSES YAMUNA POWER LIMITED
(Constituted under section 42 (5) of Indian Electricity Act. 2003)
Sub-StationBuilding BSES (YPL) Regd. Office Karkardooma,
Shahdara, Delhi-110032
Phone: 32978140 Fax: 22384886
E-mail:cgrfbypl@hotmail.com
SECY/CHN 015/08NKS

C A No. 100002021
Complaint No. 117/2026

In the matter of:

Sharad Kumar Jain ....Complainant

VERSUS

BSES Yamuna Power Limited ....Respondent

Quorum:

1. Mr. Shalabh Kumar, Chairman
2. Mr. P.K. Agrawal, Member (Legal)
3. Mr. S.R. Khan, Member (Technical)

Appearance:

1. Mr.Ashish Yadav, Counsel for the complainant
2. Mr. Rahul Saini, Mr. R.S. Bisht, Mr. Prashant Behra, Ms. Monika Sharma, Ms. Chhavi Rani & Mr. Akshat Aggarwal, On behalf of BYPL

ORDER
Date of Hearing: 07th July, 2026
Date of Order: 10th July, 2026

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

1. The brief facts of the grievance are that the complainant has challenged the illegal retrospective supplementary electricity demand and consequential disconnection proceedings against CA No. 100002021 installed at premises no. 340-A/4, Friends Colony Industrial Area, G.T Road, Delhi-110032.

The complainant also stated that he is the lawful owner of the subject premises and user of electricity connection bearing CA No. 100002021

Attested True Copy
Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

and paid electricity bills raised by the respondent on time. That the complainant transferred the premises in favour of the present complainant namely, Murlidhar Pareek, however the electricity connection continued to remain recorded in the erstwhile name of Mr. Sharad Kumar Jain.

2. The respondent in its reply against the complaint of the complainant submitted that the complainant has challenged supplementary bill dated 15th April 2026 raised for a sum of Rs.49,39,696.72 (rounded to Rs.49,39,600/-) for the period of 03-10-2018 to 01-01-2026 at premises bearing no. 340-A/4, Friends Colony Industrial Area, G.T Road, Delhi-110032 againstCA No. 100002021. The Complainant Sh. MurlidharPareek, vide sale deed dated 03.08.2015 purchased the aforesaid property and using the electricity connection. That on 03.10.2018, burnt electricity meter No.17069834 installed at the premises was replaced with CT electricity meter bearing No.19010024 against CA No. 100002021 having CT Ratio 200/5A. However, at the time of feeding particulars in the billing database system, due to an inadvertent punching/clerical error, the CT Ratio was wrongly punched as 100/5A, resulting in application of Multiplication Factor 20 instead of correct Multiplication Factor 40. It is further submitted that the meter was tested on 02.02.2026 and it was noticed that the same CT meter having ratio of 200/5A has been installed at site. The officials of the respondent verified the billing records and it was confirmed that multiplying factor incorrectly applied as MF-20 instead of MF-40 due to punching error at the time of meter replacement on 03.10.2018. Consequently it was found that the consumer had been billed at 50% half of the actual consumption w.e.f. 03.10.2018 to 01.01.2026, resulting into under billing of 416235 (KVAH) units.

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

It is further submitted that since the consumption bills from 03.10.2018 were raised by applying multiplying factor of MF-20 instead of multiplying factor MF-40 as such supplementary bill dated 15.04.2026 for under billed units 416235 (KVAH) was raised for the period 03-10-2018 to 01-01-2026 amounting to Rs.49,39,696.72 (rounded to Rs.49,39,600/-) according to applicable tariff without any penalty/late payment surcharge.

3. The complainant in its rejoinder denied the allegations stated by the respondent in its reply. It is stated that the ascertainment of the applicable CT ratio and its punching in the system and consequent calculation based on applicable multiplier falls within the exclusive domain of the respondent, upon which the complainant has no control, nor has any means to verify its veracity. It is also not known that whether correct CT ratio or wrong ratio has been taken even at the present stage and thus without the ascertainment of the same from any third party accredited laboratory or expert it cannot be said that the applied CT ratio or multiplier are correct. The impugned demand of arrears of electricity dues are time barred and the respondent is not entitled to disconnect the electricity connection or entitled to recover the arrears in view of Section 56 (2) of Regulation 42 of DERC Supply Code, 2017. It is also stated that the respondent cannot reckon or hold threshold date of dues when it becomes first due as per its convenience. That the respondent failed to periodic inspection of the meter as per the Regulation 32 of DERC Supply Code, 2017. Further, the manner of an attempt to recover of the arrears by the respondent is arbitrary and illegal and in contravention of the welfare scheme envisaged under the Regulation, which provides recovery of dues not leter than 2 years, through civil suit.

4. Arguments of both the parties are heard

Attested True Copy
Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

5. During the course of arguments, O.P argued that due to inadvertent punching/clerical error, the CT ratio was wrongly punched as 100/5A instead of 200/5A due to which the consumer had been billed at 50% half of the actual consumption w.e.f. 03.10.2018 to 10.10.2026 resulting into under billing of 416235 (KVAH) units. The complainant argued that the respondent has failed to conduct periodic inspection of the meter and as per the Regulation 32 of the DERC Supply Code, 2017, the respondent cannot recover dues later than 2 years and the respondent is trying to recover arrears of more than 8 years without following guidelines.

6. From the narration of facts and materials placed before uswe find that the complainant has challenged supplementary bill dated 15th April 2026 raised for a sum of Rs.49,39,696.72 (Rounded to Rs.49,39,600/-) for the period 03.10.2018 to 01.01.2026 due to inadvertent punching/clerical error because of which the CT ratio was wrongly punched as 100/5A instead of 200/5A. After the testing of meter, it was confirmed that multiplying factor incorrectly applied as MF-20 instead of MF-40 due to which the consumer had been billed at 50%/half of the actual consumption.

7. We have carefully considered the pleadings, documents placed on record and the submissions advanced by both the parties.

It is an admitted position that the electricity meter installed at the complainant's premises was replaced on **03.10.2018** with a CT meter bearing No. 19010024 having **CT Ratio 200/5A**. It has also been established from the records produced by the respondent that, at the time of feeding the meter particulars into the billing database, the CT Ratio was inadvertently entered as 100/5A instead of **200/5A**. Consequently, the Multiplication Factor (MF) was wrongly taken as **20** instead of the applicable **40**, resulting in billing of only 50% of the actual recorded consumption.

Attested True Copy
Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

Upon verification of the metering installation on **02.02.2026**, the error was detected and the respondent raised a supplementary bill dated **15.04.2026** towards the differential energy charges for the under-billed consumption.

The complainant has primarily challenged the supplementary demand on the ground that the same is barred under Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act, 2003 and Regulation 42 of the DERC Supply Code and Performance Standards Regulations, 2017. The Commission is unable to accept the said contention.

Section 56(2) of the Electricity Act places a restriction upon the licensee's power to disconnect electricity supply for recovery of sums which have remained unpaid for a period exceeding two years unless such sums have been shown continuously as recoverable. The said provision does not extinguish or wipe out the liability of a consumer to pay charges for electricity actually consumed. It also does not prohibit correction of a bona fide billing error resulting in under-assessment of energy charges. The supplementary bill in the present case is not founded upon any fresh assessment or penal proceedings but merely seeks recovery of charges for electricity admittedly consumed but inadvertently left unbilled owing to an internal clerical error in application of the Multiplication Factor.

It is well settled that where the consumer has actually consumed electricity, the distribution licensee is entitled to recover the legitimate charges corresponding to such consumption. The material placed on record establishes that the meter was correctly recording consumption and there is no allegation of any defect in the meter itself. The only error occurred while entering the CT ratio in the billing software, which resulted in application of an incorrect Multiplication Factor. Therefore, the supplementary demand represents the value of electricity actually consumed by the complainant and cannot be termed as an arbitrary or illegal demand.

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

At the same time, the Forum finds that the error admittedly originated due to negligence on the part of the respondent's officials while updating the billing records. The consumer had no role in the said mistake and had no means to verify the technical parameters such as CT ratio or Multiplication Factor. Had the respondent exercised due diligence and conducted timely verification of the billing parameters, the discrepancy could have been detected much earlier, thereby avoiding accumulation of a substantial liability over several years.

In these peculiar facts and circumstances, while the respondent is legally entitled to recover the differential energy charges representing actual consumption, the consumer deserves equitable relief on account of the respondent's admitted negligence. The ends of justice would be met by permitting payment of the supplementary demand in easy instalments, waiving the Late Payment Surcharge (LPSC) on the supplementary bill and awarding reasonable compensation to the complainant for the inconvenience and hardship caused due to the respondent's lapse.

ORDER

The complaint is **disposed of** with the following directions:-

a) The supplementary bill dated **15.04.2026** raised against **CA No. 100002021** is held to be **valid and recoverable**, being towards charges for electricity actually consumed but under-billed due to an inadvertent clerical error in application of the Multiplication Factor.

b) The respondent shall permit the complainant to pay the supplementary demand in **30 (thirty) equal monthly instalments**, payable along with the regular current electricity bills.

Attested True Copy

Secretary
CGRF(BYPL)

Complaint No. 117/2026

c) **No Late Payment Surcharge (LPSC), interest or any penal charges** shall be levied on the supplementary demand, provided the complainant pays each instalment and the current electricity bills within their respective due dates.

d) In view of the admitted error on the part of the respondent resulting in prolonged under-billing and consequent hardship to the complainant, the respondent is directed to pay **compensation of Rs. 10,000/-** to the complainant. The said amount may be adjusted as a credit in the complainant's future electricity bills.

e) OP is further directed to file compliance report within 21 days of the action taken on this order.

f) If the Order is not appealed against within the stipulated time, the same shall be deemed to have attained finally.

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

10/7/26

(P.K. AGRAWAL)
MEMBER (LEGAL)

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

(SHALABH KUMAR)
CHAIRMAN

Attested True Copy
Secretary
CGRF (BYPL)