

BEFORE THE DISTRICT CONSUMER DISPUTES REDRESSAL FORUM, REWARI.

Consumer Complaint No:118 of 2016.

Date of Institution: 04.04.2016.

Date of Decision: 03.01.2018.

Rajbir Singh son of Shri Sher Singh age 49 years, resident of village Nangal Pathani, Tehsil Kosli Distt. Rewari.

.....Complainant.

Versus

- 1.) Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam through its Sub Divisional Officer / A.G.M. Kosli, Tehsil Kosli , Distt. Rewari.
- 2.) Sub Divisional Officer / A.G.M. Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Kosli, Tehsil Kosli, Distt. Rewari.
- 3.) Junior Engineer, Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Ltd. Palhawas, Tehsil and Distt. Rewari.
- 4.) Executive Engineer (OP), Dakshin Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam, Rewari, Tehsil and Distt. Rewari.

.....Opposite Parties.

Complaint Under Section 12 of Consumer Protection Act

Before: Shri S.B.Lohia.....President.
Shri Kapil Dev Sharma..... Member.

Present : Shri Ashok Yadav ,Advocate for complainant.
Shri J.C.Yadav, Advocate for the opposite parties.

ORDER

{ **Per S.B.Lohia, President** }

Briefly stated the complainant is having a tubewell connection no. NT-5/4 in the name of his grandfather Umrao Singh (since deceased) and paid the last bill on 16.1.2004. It is alleged that the said connection was made PDCO on 10.12.2002 due to insufficient water in the tubewell. Now he has bored the tubewell, and thus he vide his application dated 23.12.2013 applied for the restoration of the connection vide

sale circular no.D-66/2013 dated 19.11.2013 but the connection was not restored. Hence, this complaint.

2) In the reply, all the contents have been denied alleging that there was no circular and no rule for the restoration of PDCO connection as alleged by the complainant . The complainant never moved any application as alleged.

3) We have heard the counsel for the parties and gone through the record of the case available on the file thoroughly.

4) Application Ex. CW-3 shows that the complainant applied to the SDO DHBVNL for the restoration of the Tubewell connection as per Sales Circular no.D-66/2013. This application has been duly received by the officials of the opposite parties on 4.1.2016. In the application, it is specifically alleged by the complainant that he had made an application on 27.12.2013 which was bearing diary no. 4860. Further he has placed Sales circular no. D-66/2013 Ex.CW-4 which is related to RCO of Tubewell connection - Annesty -2013. A perusal of Ex.CW-5 a letter dt. 25.2.2014 from Senior Feeder Manager Palhawas to SDO, OP S/ Division, Kosli shows that some process was going on the application of the complainant. However, on the other hand there is nothing on the file to show that what action was taken on the application of the complainant. The opposite parties denied all the facts. In the circumstances, in our view, it would be just and proper if the concerned SDO of opposite parties is directed to pass a speaking order and to decide the application Ex. CW-3 keeping in view the Sale circular no. D-66/2013 Ex. CW-4 , after giving an opportunity of hearing to the complainant within 45 days from the date of receipt of the copy of this order. With these observations, the present complaint is disposed of accordingly.

Announced
03.01.2018.

President
Distt. Consumer Disputes
Redressal Forum, Rewari.

Member,
DCDRF, Rewari.