

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

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

Date :

Case No. 168

Hearing Dt. 26/03/2008

In the matter of incorrect supplementary bill

Shri V.P. Kadam

- Appellant

Vs.

MSEDCL, Mulund (E)

- Respondent

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 Appellant

- 1) Shri V.P. Kadam, Consumer.

C - On behalf of Respondent

- 1) Mr. G. Y. Chavan-Patil, Dy. Ex. Engr., Mulund Division.
- 2) Mr. S. D. Sonwalkar, U.D.C., Mulund Division.

PREAMBLE :

The consumer registered his grievance with this Forum on 28th Feb. 2008 vide case No. 168 and hearing date was fixed on 26/03/2008 at 12.00 hrs. Consumer was aggrieved with the decision of ICGRC order vide letter No. SE/THNUC/TS/ICGRC/463, dtd. 23rd January 2008.

CONSUMER'S SAY:

Shri Vijay P. Kadam having consumer No. 000092132901 at D-154, R.S. Sukhada CHS, Navghar Road, Mulund (E), Mumbai - 400 081. Consumer is having single phase LT residential connection. He was paying his electricity bills regularly.

- 1) His meter was working in normal condition and he was receiving bills for monthly consumption with normal status.
- 2) His average consumption from February 2007 to August 2007 was 232 units per month approx.
- 3) On September 14, 2007, MSEDCL replaced the meter with new meter No. 9000017391 on ground of slow meter by 67.62%
- 4) Accordingly, utility raised the supplementary bill for 1595 units for Rs. 8970 on 29th September 2007.
- 5) Meter replacement report was not provided to the consumer with final and initial readings of old and new meter.
- 6) Meter testing was carried out on low load which does not reflect the accuracy of the meter. Meter accuracy report was not provided to the consumer.
- 7) Consumer took an objection on knowledge of the MSEDCL staff against
 - a) Range of accucheck meter

- b) Load condition to check the accuracy of the meter and spot inspection report did not filled with ever column mentioned in the form.
- 8) Utility did not check his meter on meter testing bench even if he insisted on the test.
- 9) The consumption pattern of new and old meter was more or less similar which was 245 units per month on new meter and 232 units per month on old meter which indicate that old meter was working in normal condition.
- 10) The supplementary bill was issued without consultation of the consumer. The method of calculation for supplementary bill was unknown to him and was not explained by the utility.
- 11) Utility raised supplementary bill considering 740 units per month, which comes to 25 units per day, which was not acceptable to the consumer as considering previous and new meter pattern consumption.
- 12) Consumer raised the doubt against accucheck meter's accuracy and requested to submit it's certificate of accuracy

Prayer:

To withdraw the incorrect supplementary bill raised by MSEDCL and continue the normal billing as recorded by the energy meter.

UTILITY'S SAY:

- 1) The consumer raised the objection of incorrect supplementary bill raised by utility having consumer No. 000092132901/ B.U. 3557.
- 2) The concerned Jr. Engr. visited consumer's premises for routine meter calibration on 14/09/2007. During the inspection the meter was found slow by 67.62%

- 3) The meter was calibrated in presence of consumer.
- 4) Meter was also opened in present of consumer on the same day and no internal/external discrepancies were noted.
- 5) During the hearing the zerox copy of the spot inspection report was given by the utility.
- 6) The old faulty meter bearing meter No. 9000017391 was immediately replaced by new meter No. 900046248. The copy of meter replacement report was submitted to the Forum.
- 7) Consumer stated that meter was tested on low load, which does not reflect meter accuracy correctly. This is the fact in case of electromagnetic meter, as the meter under consideration is electronic meter the load on which meter tested does not reflect or accuracy of meter.
- 8) Accucheck meter was purchased recently, having one-year accuracy guarantee. The copy of the same was given to the Forum.
- 9) As the consumer requested for testing the meter on meter bench, which is not possible as the meter was opened to know the modus operandi the internal wires were relocated (one wire was opened during the testing) hence the meter cannot be tested on testing bench.
- 10) As on consumer's request, the calculation for supplementary bill is given as follows :
Percentage slowness (-) 67.62%
Formula for recovery = Consumption x 100/100.00 (-) 67.62 = 32.38
Bill already issued for

June-07 for 246 units $\times 100/32.38 = 760$ units.

It means already bill (-) 246

To be bills (+) 760

Diff = 514 units recovery is to be effected for June-2007.

Likewise for the test months i.e. July 2007, August 2007 & final reading at the time of inspection for charging difference is considered for recovery purpose.

In short already billed units during June 2007 to August 2007 final reading.

IR = (-) 10332 (-) 764

FR = (+) 11096 (+) 2359

Diff 764×100 to be recovered/ $32.38 = 2359$ (-) 764 = Total 1595 units recovered.

OBSERVATIONS:

1) As per consumer's view, meter was working in normal condition and was receiving electricity bills with normal status in every month. There was no need to change the meter.

As utility says, routine check up was carried out with accucheck on 14/09/2007 and consumer's meter was found slow by 67.62 %, which was abnormal. Hence the meter was tested & opened in the presence of the consumer and was replaced by another meter immediately. Considering the above fact, utility's stand seems to be normal and correct, to check the meter and replaced it with new meter.

2) Utility was not provided the meter replacement report. Utility further clarified that the meter being as electronic make and has not relevance with power load as alleged by the consumer.

The consumer further alleged that the average consumption of previous 7 months recorded by previous months and subsequently on the new changed meter the average consumption is much more similar. On the other hand utility is insisting on the presumption on 67.62% slowness of previous meter and based on that calculated a monthly consumption of the consumer as 740 units per month as against 245 units per month claimed by he consumer. Thus the result of accucheck is not acceptable to the consumer.

Utility further clarified that consumer's request for another meter check on testing bench cannot be carried out because while opening the meter (alleged 67.62% slow) one of the wires from the meter was broken and disconnected. In the course of hearing both the consumer and utility agreed to test the meter at the laboratory of the manufacture of the meter. The Lab is located in Mumbai. The utility should take up the meter in consultation with the consumer to the manufacturer's Lab.

Utility Officials have also erred while carrying out accucheck the report of which should have been given to the consumer personally explaining all the columns as the columns of the report are not understood by the consumer and not explained fully.

ORDER

- 1) The alleged slow running meter should be taken to meter's manufacture's Lab at Mumbai. The copy of report should be given to the consumer.
- 2) Based on that Lab report further billing action should be taken.
- 3) The action should be reported to the Forum within two months from the date of issued of these orders.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup on 15th of April 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

