

**Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.
Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup**

Ref. No. Secretary/MSEDCL/CGRF/BNDUZ/

Date :

Case No. 153

Hearing Dt. 13/02/2008

In the matter of new connections to residential & commercial complex

Shri Mangesh M. Achrekar

- Applicant (Consumer)

Vs.

MSEDCL, Bhandup

- Opponent (Utility)

Present during the hearing

A - On behalf of CGRF, Bhandup

- 1) Shri S.L. Kulkarni, Chairman, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 2) Shri S.B. Wahane, Member Secretary, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 3) Mrs. Manik P. Datar, Member, CGRF, Bhandup.

B - On behalf of Applicant

- 1) Shri Mangesh M. Achrekar.

C - On behalf of Respondent

- 1) Shri Bhatkar, Ex. Engr., Bhandup.
- 2) Shri Wade, Dy. Ex. Engr., Bhandup.

PREAMBLE :

The consumer registered his grievance with this Forum on 1st Feb. 2008 vide case No. 153. His basic complaint was for threat of disconnection of his energy supply. He requested the Forum to issue an interim directive to the utility officials to refrain them from disconnection of his domestic energy supply till the

issuance of the final order from the Forum as he had received a threatening notice from the utility.

CONSUMER'S SAY :

Shri Mangesh M. Achrekar is having a connection in the name of M/s. Chintamani Enterprises, having consumer No. 000056061134 at B/004, Ridhi Sidhi Apartment, near BMC ward, LBS road, Bhandup. He is using the said connection for residential purpose.

MSEDCL, Bhandup division sent him a notice dtd. 18/01/2008 vide letter No. 48 for disconnection of supply for non payment of electricity bills issued by utility as per clause 56 of E.A. 2003. The arrears of this connection were Rs. 99,257.43. The notice clearly mentioned that if the arrears were not paid upto 02/02/2008 the supply would be disconnect without any further notice.

After receiving the notice, Mr. Achrekar, came to the Forum's office for interim order for non disconnection of energy supply till the issuance of final orders from the Forum during which Forum can decide the mater on merits.

After hearing both the parties, Forum issued him interim order vide ref.no. Secretary/MSEDCL/CGRF/BNDUZ/00016, dtd. 25th Jan. 2008. In the course of the hearing, it was observed that the consumer had not paid the energy bills from 09/04/2007. Forum had issued him an order to pay the last six months average energy bill, which was agreed to by the consumer.

Consumer wrote a letter on 08/05/2007 to Executive Engineer, Ishwar Nagar division, Bhandup division stating that bill for April 2007 was of 424 units for Rs. 1720/-, which was abnormal. His consumption for previous six months was 200 to 250 units/per month.

Hence he requested utility to check his meter. He got a letter for disconnection of his electric supply from MSEDCL on 26/07/2007 for non payment of bill for Rs. 17,666.79. He again wrote a letter to Executive Engineer (accounts) explaining that as per his letter dtd. 08/05/2007, his meter was not working properly and had requested utility for checking of the meter. But utility

did not take any cognizance of his letter and the bill, which was received from utility, was abnormal and excessive. He again requested utility to check the meter. After that utility neither checked his meter and nor disconnect his supply till Jan-2007. However, he again got a disconnection letter on 18/01/2008 for non-payment of energy bills for Rs. 99,257.43.

His prayer is to check the meter and issue him a proper bill considering his consumption from the date of connection to March 2007. He again reiterated that from April-2007 to Dec-2007 he was getting bills for 424, 1255, 1539, 1246, 957, 1757, 1422, 4235, 3091 units/per month which was very high for his one bedroom flat.

UTILITY'S SAY :

On 25th Jan-2008, CGRF issued an interim order hearing from both the parties. Forum gave an order to utility to check his meter immediately. As per the directives from Executive Engineer, Shri Mologi, Dy. Ex.Engr. visited the premises of the consumer.

The consumer Shri Mangesh Mohan Achrekar residing at the above premises having consumer No. 000056061134 connected with meter No. 039273 was having sanctioned load of 3 kW. To solve the complaint utility fixed series meter with the existing meter and observed that the existing meter was 12.5% recording excess energy. The existing meter showed 32 units against fixed series meter 28 units.

Utility visited his home and found that the connected load is 8.2 KW against his sanctioned load of 3 KW. The consumer is having 1 ton split AC, 2 Geysers, 4 tube lights, 1 micro oven, 1 fridge, 29" and 14" 2 TV sets etc. The total connected load comes to approx 8.2 KW.

During the hearing utility stated that the meter of the consumer was found only 12.5% fast, we will revise his bill accordingly since utility had carried out the test of energy consumption by putting a series meter which is most reliable method of checking. The utility has strong pleading that the consumer will have

to pay the consumption bill by deducting 12.5% reduced energy bill which will be correct.

OBSERVATIONS:

1) Consumer after receiving the bill of month of April 2007 for 424 units. Complained to utility of excess bill and requested for checking of his meter. The utility did not respond to this but sent a notice of disconnection on 26/07/2007 on the ground of non payment of energy bill for Rs. 17,666.79. Utility did not respond even on his personal approach to utility office, which ultimately sent to him a notice of disconnection on 18/01/2008 for non payment of arrears Rs. 99,257.43. Fearing a threat of disconnection of supply the consumer approached CGRF for intervention in the matter.

2) After hearing both the parties the CGRF on 25th Jan-2008 issued an order directing the consumer to pay to utility's office an amount equal to past 6 months' average bill. The consumer agreed to this but did not make payment to utility at all.

3) In the same interim order CGRF directed the utility to check the accuracy of consumer's meter, which was carried out, and it was noticed that the meter was working 12.5% fast. Utility is prepared to reduce consumer's bill by charging 12.5% less from his first complaint. It was also observed that the consumer had enhanced his connected load to 8.2 KW against sanction load of 3 KW.

4) On perusal of consumer's personal ledger (CPL) it is seen that during the period April -2007 to Jan-2008 the energy bills issued to the consumer were showing abnormal excessive energy consumption. For example for the month of Nov & Dec-2007 the consumed units were shown as 4235 & 3091 respectively. However, considering electrical instruments in consumer's residential premises and the connected load the consumption pattern comes to on an average 700 units/per month. It would be in fairness to charge the consumer the energy bills for the period April-2007 to Jan-2008 presuming the consumption of 700 units/per month. It is also essential to change the previous meter of the consumer by providing a new duly checked meter.

It needs to be mentioned here that had the utility taken immediate cognizance of the consumer's first complaint of the meter in April 2007 the consumer would not have been required to approach CGRF and accumulation of huge bill arrears. Hence the consumer is required to be given this benefit.

ORDER

Consumer's old meter be replaced with new duly checked meter and he should be billed at the consumption of 700 units/per month for the period April 2007 to Jan-2008.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup on 3rd of March 2008.

Note : 1) If Consumer is not satisfied with the decision, he may go in appeal within 60 days from date of receipt of this order to the Electricity Ombudsman in attached "Form B".

Address of the Ombudsman

The Electricity Ombudsman,
Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,
606, Keshav Building,
Bandra - Kurla Complex, Bandra (E),
Mumbai - 400 051.

2) If utility is not satisfied with order, it may go in appeal before the Hon. High Court within 60 days from receipt of the order.

MRS. M.P. DATAR
MEMBER
CGRF, BHANDUP

S.L. KULKARNI
CHAIRMAN
CGRF, BHANDUP

S.B. WAHANE
MEMBER SECRETARY
CGRF, BHANDUP

**Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.
Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup**

Ref. No. Secretary/MSEDCL/CGRF/BNDUZ/

Date :

Case No. 153

Hearing date :23/01/2008

Shri Mangesh Mohan Acharekar

- Appellant

Vs.

MSEDCL, Bhandup.

- Opponent

In the matter of Interim order

The consumer is having a connection in the name of M/s. Chintamani Enterprises having consumer No. 000056061134 at B/004 Ridhi Sidhi Apartment, near B.M.C. 'S' Ward, LBS Road, Bhandup. The said consumer is using it by Mr. Mangesh M. Acharekar, who is a residential consumer for residential purpose.

The consumer approached this Forum personally on 23/01/2008 with a plea that he has been given a notice by the utility's competent officials to pay the energy bill outstanding Rs. 99,257/- else to face disconnection of the supply. As a residential power user he is surprised to receive such unbelievable energy bill. He wants to put his case before the Forum on merits. He has therefore requested the Forum to issue interim directive to the utility officials to refrain them from disconnection till the correctness of the energy bills is examined.

The Forum heard the consumer and Executive Engineer, MSEDCL (Shri Bhatkar) on 23/01/2008. In the course of hearing of this grievance, it was revealed that the consumer has not paid the energy bills for the last six months, which should have been paid by him. The consumer agreed to this and to make payment immediately.

Accordingly, the Forum directs the utility officials (MSEDCL) not to accept the payment of energy bill as the average of past six months and not to disconnect the energy bill till the issuance of final orders of this Forum

**CHAIRMAN
CGRF, MSEDCL,
BHANDUP**

copy to :

- 1) **Shri Mangesh Mohan Acharekar,**
B-004, Riddhi-Siddhi Apt.,,
LBS Road, Bhandup,
MUMBAI – 400 078
- 2) **The Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, O&M Divn., Bhandup.**

- with a request to attend the hearing of the case on 13/02/2008 at 12.00 with a relevant case papers.

