

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

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

Date :

Case No. 190

Hearing Dt. 23/06/2008

In the matter of threat of disconnection of power supply by utility

Shri Mohanlal B. Mistry

- Appellant

Vs.

MSEDCL, Mulund

- 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 Mohanlal B. Mistry, Consumer.

C - On behalf of Respondent

- 1) Shri Shirke, Dy. Ex. Engr., Mulund division.

The applicant vide it's letter dtd. 23/05/2008 registered his grievance stating that utility's Mulund officials had harassed him by removing his energy connection meter and charged the cost of new meter as also fictitious excessive bill, which they compelled him to pay.

The utility had alleged that the old meter, which was being used by the consumer, was running slow. Although his supply is not yet disconnected, he is under threat of disconnection.

The case was heard on 23/06/2008. The utility submitted following

The utility's staff had carried out in the course of theft detection drive on 12/05/2008 that the meter of this consumer was found running slow by 32.79%. To investigate the slowness of the meter, it was opened in the presence of representative of consumer Shri Dinesh Kumar. It was found that the current coil was burnt which resulted into the slowness. The same was shown to consumer's representative and was asked to arranged to payment of energy bill as per under section 126 of E.A. 2003.

As the meter coil was burnt, he was asked to make payment of meter cost of Rs. 700/-, which was paid on 13/05/2008 by the consumer, and new meter was installed on the same day. Obviously temporary disconnection was only for short period till the replacement of the meter after recovery of meter cost and 50% of assessed bill i.e. 3000/-. Obviously the consumer at any moment was not harassed. The joint inspection report of the meter was prepared in the presence of the consumer's representative Mr. Dineshkumar the copy of which indicates that it was duly signed by him.

Now, the consumer is bringing the pressure to reduce the assessed bill. Since the case is under section 126 of E.A. 2003, the consumer will have to approach to Appellate Authority i.e. Chief Engineer, P.W.D., Chembur, Mumbai.

OBSERVATIONS & ORDER:

On perusal of provisions under section 126 of E.A. 2003, the CGRF has no jurisdiction in the matter as clearly envisage in MERC (CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman) regulation 2006 vide regulation 6.8 (A). The consumer will have to prefer an appeal against the assessed bill given by the utility to the Chief Engineer, PWD, Chembur, Mumbai.

The case therefore is dismissed and closed. The parties be informed accordingly.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup on 16th of July 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**