

**BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM**  
**AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD**

**Case No. CGRF/AZ/PBN/31/ 2006/11.**

**Date of Filing: 28 / 12 / 2006.**

**Date of decision: 01.02.07**

**Smt Gangatai Arjun Kute The Consumer Complainant.**

**R/o Shivajinagar,Jintur, Dist.Parbhani**

**V/s**

**MAHARASHTRA ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION  
CO.LTD. AURANGABAD.--- The Distribution Licensee.**

**MAHARASHTRA ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION  
CO.LTD. AURANGABAD.--- The Distribution Licensee.**

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

1. The consumer complainant Smt.Gangatai Arjunrao kure r/o Shivajinagar,Junitur,Dist .Parbhani, ( Con.No.540010363114) has filed her grievance in Annexure “ A “ before this Forum on 28.12.2006 under Regulations No. 6.10 of the Regulations 2006. A copy of the grievance was forwarded on 28.12.06 to the Nodal officer and Executive Engineer (Adm) in the office of the Superintending Engineer, Parbhani with a request to furnish his response on the grievance within fifteen days and hearing in the matter was fixed on 18.01.07.
2. The grievance of the consumer, in brief, as per consumer, is as below.  
The electricity connection is in the name of her husband viz. Arjun and the consumer number quoted above is allotted to him and since he ( Arjun) is dead, the present consumer complainant has filed the grievance. The consumer in her grievance has stated that she was receiving electricity bills regularly till Fe.2005, which she has paid regularly. Since her husband was in service at different places her house at Jintur

remained closed and she was given bills with door lock status and the same has been paid by her. It is further stated that in the bill for March/April 2005 she was given bill for Rs. 9000/ at an average of 300 units per month. The bill given was exceedingly high though the meter functioning was normal.

Cont:

“2”

The meter of the consumer was replaced on 9.3.05 and the reading of old meter at that time was 1189 and the reading of the new meter was 005. She has applied to the concerned authorities of the MSEDCL on 30.5.05, 20.10.06 and 17.12.06 to rectify the bill but without considering her application she was given bill for Nov.06 amounting to Rs. 36390/. She was also threatened of disconnection in case bill was not paid. In March 06 her supply was disconnected without any pre intimation. It is further stated that she has paid Rs.15000/ till date because of threat of disconnection. The consumer ,it is stated has paid the same by borrowing the money with interest as she did not have the money. The consumer has therefore requested to order MSEDCL to give correct and rectified bills , to waive interest and penal charges levied against her and to grant Rs.17000/ as compensation on account of expenditure incurred for number of trips undertaken from Jintur to Parbhani & vice versa and Rs.12000/ as medical expenses which she was required to incurred as she has fallen sick on account this. The consumer has nominated one Shri Nagare Khushal as her representative before the Forum to the extent of this grievance.

3. On date of hearing i.e.18.1.07, representative of consumer Shri Nagare was present. The Nodal officer shri Kamble and Asst. Engineer Shri Jadhav were present on behalf of the D.L. The Nodal officer stated that the grievance of the consumer is in the process of redressal and requested for some time . The Nodal officer and consumer representative were directed to sit together, discuss and if possible, arrive at a consensus. The consumer and Nodal officer, were directed as above as the Nodal officer agreed to the most of the contentions of the consumer. The matter was adjourned to 25.1.07.

4. On 25.1.07, neither the consumer nor the Nodal officer was present. However a letter was received from Nodal officer stating that the bill of the consumer has been rectified and the consumer representative Shri Nagare has accepted the bill. An application to that effect signed by Shri Nagare was also sent along with the letter. In the application the consumer representative has stated that the bill has been rectified and the according to that Rs. 100/ is payable and the same is acceptable to him. The case was therefore reserved for decision.
5. We have gone through the grievance and copies of the documents filed along with the grievance. Since no response to the grievance was filed by the Nodal officer, we have

Cont:

“3”

gone through the letter dt.22.1.07 from the Nodal officer stating redressal of the grievance. On going through the meter replacement report we find that the meter was replaced on 9.3.05 and the reading of the old meter at the time of removal of old meter was 1189 and the reading of the new meter was 005. The serial number of old meter was 14319 and that of the new meter was 6091384 . On going through the CPL we find that though the meter is replaced on 9.3.05 , the CPL discloses meter number of the consumer as 14319 till Dec.2005 and it is in Jan 06, the CPL discloses the number of meter of the new meter for the first time. On account of this it is quite obvious that the entries in the CPL can not be taken to be authentic.

6. As stated above the consumer and Nodal officer were directed to sit together ,discuss and if possible, arrive at a consensus so far as the grievance was concerned. The Nodal officer vide his letter dt.22.1.07 has stated that the grievance of the consumer is redressed and application of the consumer representative stating that the bill is rectified to Rs. 100/ and is acceptable to him is also enclosed along with the letter. We therefore are of the opinion that the grievance of the consumer is redressed. This observation is being made in view of the fact that the bill

is rectified by MSEDCL amounting to Rs.100/ and the same is accepted to the consumer.

7. Though the grievance of the consumer is redressed the fact remains that the grievance of the consumer was correct and the Distribution licensee has not cared to give any consideration to the applications given by the consumer from time to time. The electricity connection of the consumer was also disconnected once for not paying excess bills , which is later admitted by the D.L.. The consumer has asked for compensation of Rs.17000/ which includes Rs.12000/ as medical expenses required to be incurred by her as she has fallen sick and for to & fro expenses incurred by her for traveling from Jintir to Parbhani & vice versa. We find the prayer of the consumer to be very vague and not justified.. However it is quite obvious that the consumer has suffered inconvenience as well as harassment at the hands of the DL. The consumer therefore deserves to be compensated. Hence the following order.

#### **ORDER**

1. **The grievance of the consumer so far as excess billing and rectification thereof is concerned stands redressed. The grievance to this extent stands discharged , in light of compromise reached between the parties.**

Cont:

“4”

2. **The Distribution licensee is directed to pay Rs.500/ as compensation to the consumer for the inconvenience and harassment caused to her..**

**The Distribution Licensee .& 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**

**V.G.JOSHI**  
**MEMBER SECRETARY**

**( R.K.PINGLE)**  
**CHAIRMAN**