

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD

(Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/48/2007/17).

Smt. Nirmala B.Ambhore -- Consumer Complainant.

V/s

**MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY BOARD,
The Distribution Licensee.**

Date:- 19.06.2007

Sub: Grievance under the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,
(Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman)
Regulations, 2006

INTERIM ORDER

The Distribution Licensee is directed to reconnect the Electricity supply of the consumer on payment of 50 % of the amount of the bill dated 05..02.2007 (which is for Rs. 1200/-) This Interim order shall be subject to final decision on the grievance of the consumer, that may be passed.

(H.A.Kapadia)
Member

(R.K.Pingale)
Chairman

To,

- 1. The Executive Engineer (Adm.)
O/O Superintending Engineer
M.S.E.D.C.L. Urban Circle
Aurangabad.**
- 2. Smt. Nirmala Bhaurao Ambhore
“Sara Siddhi” A-3, Harsool
Aurangabad.**

Sub: Grievance in case No. CGRE/AZ/ AUR//48/2007/17

Please find enclosed herewith copy of the order passed by the Forum in the case mentioned above.

The consumer , if not satisfied with the decision of the Forum, is at liberty to make a representation to the Electricity Ombudsman , the contact details of whom is as under within a period of 60 days from the date of this order.

Yours faithfully

Encl: A/A

Contact details of Electricity Ombudsman:

**The Electricity Ombudsman
Maharashtra Electricity Ombudsman Commission
606-608, Keshava Building , Bandra-Kurla Complex
Mumbai 400 051
Tel.No: 022-26590339**

“2”

The consumer contended that every time she has to visit the office of the D.L. to collect the electricity bill. It is also contended that she has applied number of times and finally on 15.11.05 she has given application in Shahgunj sub division of the D.L. but invain. On continuous persuasion with the D.L. she was told that a new meter will be given to her on payment of Rs. 1000/. The consumer has contended that a faulty meter is installed and she cannot be held responsible therefor and hence it is unjust to ask her to pay Rs. 1000/ .Not only that on 03.06.07, her electricity was disconnected. She has therefore requested the Forum to direct the D.L. to replace the meter without any charges and she should be paid Rs.20000/ as compensation for the harassment caused to her.

The consumer on 18.6.07 requested for an interim order seeking reconnection of electricity. The application for was kept for hearing on 19.6.07 and notice thereof was given to the nodal officer. On 19.6.07, the representative of consumer was present. No body was present on behalf of D.L., but an application was filed on behalf of Nodal Officer for adjournment of hearing as he cannot present himself and no details are available with him. The request of Nodal officer was rejected. The Forum on 19.6.07, by interim order directed the D.L. to reconnect the supply of the consumer on payment of 50% of the amount of last bill .

On the date of hearing, i.e. 12.7.07, the Nodal officer Shri Pawar was present on behalf of D.L.. The consumer or her representative was not present initially, but the representative appeared a little later. The Nodal officer filed his response on the grievance of the consumer. The Nodal officer in his response has stated that considering the connected load of the consumer, the average consumption of the consumer is @ 180 units per month whereas the average consumption charged to the consumer is in the range of 40 to 100 units per month which is on lesser side compared to connected load. The Nodal officer therefore requested to reject the grievance of the consumer.

We have gone through the grievance of the consumer and the documents filed along with the grievance. We have also gone through the response file by the Nodal officer, CPL etc. On going through the documents before us we find that the consumer by her application dt. 6.11.05 requested the D.L. to install another meter as the meter installed in her premises on 26.10.05 is not in working condition right since the time of its installation.

“3’

It is an admitted fact that the meter installed on 26.10.05 was not in working condition and it remained so till 20.6.07 and on which date a new meter was installed after the interim order passed by the Forum. Though the maintenance of the meter is the responsibility of the D.L. it is surprising that the D.L. did not care to maintain or to correct the deficiency, irrespective of repeated pursuance of the consumer. On going through the CPL we find that the consumer has been charged on average consumption of 40-100 units per month during the above said period. The consumer has paid the bills up to Feb.06 and thereafter she did not pay any bill barring one which she paid partly in August 2006. On going through the first bill, after installation of new meter i.e. bill dt.6.7.07, the consumption for the 13 days (20.6.07 to 3.7.07) is recorded as 47 units which comes between 3-4 units per day. Therefore the average consumption charged to the consumer in our opinion is not excessive. The grievance of the consumer therefore is liable to be rejected. However at the same time we would also like to observe that the first meter installed at the premises of the consumer was faulty one i.e. not in working condition. Though the consumer after 10-11 days only after the connection was released to her premises brought this fact to the notice of D.L. and requested to replace the meter nothing was done in the matter till interim order of the Forum. In the mean time her electricity was disconnected on 3.6.07 and only after interim order by the Forum her connection was restored after payment of 50% of charges due against her. Not only that the consumer every time has to run to the office of the D.L. to obtain the copy of the bill. The consumer, therefore, in our opinion deserves to be compensated for the inconvenience and the harassment caused to her. Hence the following order.

ORDER

1. The grievance of the consumer is rejected.
2. The D.L. is directed to pay compensation of Rs. 200/ to the consumer for the inconvenience and harassment caused to her.
3. The consumer is directed to pay the bill outstanding within a period of three weeks from the date of the next bill.

The D.L. & the consumer shall comply with the above order and report compliance to the Forum.

Inform the parties and close the case

(H.A.Kapadia)
Member

(A.N.Sonwane)
Member secretary

(R.K.Pingle)
Chairman

