

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

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

Date:

Case No. 200

Hearing Dt. 31/07/2008

In the matter of Compensation.

M/S Heena Touring Talkies

- Appellant

Vs.

MSEDCL-(Bhiwandi)/TPL-Bhwandi

- Opponent

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 consumer

- 1) Mr. Anil Meghraj Kankariya (Consumer Representative).

C - On behalf of Utility.

- 1) Shri M.S. Kele.-Manager M/s. Torrent Power Ltd.
- 2) Shri D.R. Bharate, Dy. Ex. Engr., Bhiwandi.

Preamble :

The consumer registered his grievance on 15/07/2008 vide case No. 200. He was aggrieved with the decision of ICGRU, TPL given on 12/05/2008.

Consumer say :

Consumer Shri Heena Touring Talkies is having LT connection bearing consumer No. 13212658124 at Sr. No. 6-7, p-2/16, 1-15, plot No. 21, house No. 58217 at Katari, Bhiwandi.

Consumer is having above meter No. and he was getting the bill regularly. But from Jan-2008, he was receiving the bills of another meter also which was not any relevance to his premises. He has given many complaints to utility regarding the matter but no cognizance was taken for 11 months, hence he approached to ICGRU, TPL. TPL accepted his grievance and credited Rs. 98,157.49, which was wrongly charged for meter No. 00000080. TPL also waived DPC and interest charged to the consumer. Hence his grievance was solved by TPL.

But he approached to CGRF for compensation of Rs. 22,400/-, which he suffered by financial loss and time and also towards the visits to various offices of TPL for 11 months.

Utility Say :

In S.No. 13212658124 i.e. Heena Cinema Talkies, the consumer has approached CGRF for compensation for his costs in visiting MSEDCL/Torrent Power Ltd. offices several times for solving his billing problem. Following are the details:

It is true that the consumer had applied various times to various offices to solve his grievance. During handling over the record from MSEDCL to TPL, there might have been some mistake & was not noticed at that time.

It is well known that most of the consumers were billed on average basis due to faulty meters. Customer Data Base and metering system were lacking completely. There was billing complaint due to non-availability of actual reading, inaccessible meters etc. Now, meters are replaced and proper reading is being taken so as to avoid billing complaints. Bill record is also updated/corrected.

However, in above case, the consumer had complained in ICGRC regarding the billing dispute that there is a one meter at site but an additional meter M0000080 was also reflected in the bill. As per the complaint, the consumer's case was attended; the month-wise breakup of all the bills (CPL) was given to the consumer. All his units for the second meter (fictitious meter) were credited along with DPC and interest.

The consumer was heard in ICGRC, TPL, Bhiwandi and resolved his all complaints regarding wrong billing & removal of unwanted meter. He has accepted in his complaint to CGRF that his billing issue has been resolved. Hence, there is case for compensation.

Observations :

It is observed that M/s. TPL accepted consumer's grievance and accordingly revised bill by giving credit of Rs. 95,158 with waiver of DPC and interest to the consumer, which was wrongly reflected in his bill. Thus the consumer's whole grievance was settled.

However, he approached to this Forum on the ground that he was required to approach to utility No. of times with written representation to settle the billing dispute. The utility did take the cognizance after 11 months but however, it is noted that during this period the utility was in a transit phase of taking over the record from MSEDCL as ut (TPL) had taken over as franchisee was appointed from 26/01/2007. It is further noted that the consumer did not pay any bill to TPL in this period also the TPL did not disconnect his supply even for a single day. In this circumstances it is true that consumer did suffering inconvenience in visiting the TPL frequently. Therefore the claim for the compensation does not bear much waitage. Further, the consumer does not have face any recurrence of this situation.

ORDER

The case is dismissed & filed. No order as to cost.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup on 2nd of August 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