



Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kalyan Zone  
Behind "Tejashree", Jahangir Meherwanji Road, Kalyan (West) 421301  
Ph – 2210707 & 2328283 Ext - 122, Fax – 2210707, E-mail : cgrfkalyan@mahadiscom.in

---

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/477/561 OF 2010-2011 OF SHRI  
RAMCHAND SUNDERDAS LAKHWANI REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER  
GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT  
EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL.**

Shri Ramchand Sunderdas Lakhwani  
Shop No. 101,  
Sai Vasan Shah Market,  
Bk. No. 355 – A, Sonar Galli,  
Ulhasnagar : 421 002

(Here in after  
referred to  
as Consumer)

**Versus**

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its Dy. Executive  
Engineer, Ulhasnagar Sub/Dn No. II

(Here in after  
referred to  
as Licensee)

- 1) Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established under regulation of "Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2006" to redress the grievances of consumers. This regulation has been made by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (MERC) vide powers

Grievance No. K/E/477/561 of 2010-2011  
conferred on it by section 181 read with sub-section 5 to 7 of section 42  
of the Electricity Act, 2003. (36 of 2003).

- 2) The consumer is a single phase LT consumer of the Licensee. The Consumer is billed as per commercial tariff. The consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 23/12/2010 regarding the Excessive Energy Bill. The details are as follows: -

Name of the consumer : Shri Ramchand Sunderdas Lakhwani

Address: - As above

Consumer No : 021510791476

Reason for Dispute : - Regarding Excessive Energy Bill

- 3) The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/976, dt. 23/12/2010 to the Nodal Officer of the Licensee, and the Licensee through Dy. Executive Engineer MSEDCL Kalyan West Sub-Division No. I filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/UIhas.I/Billing/61, dt. 17/01/2011.

- 4) The Chairperson and Member Secretary of the forum heard both the parties at length on 18/01/2011 @ 15.00 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office. Shri Vikram R. Lakhwani, Priti Chauhan and Priti Lakhwani Consumer Representatives, Shri Satish Hiranman Nemade, Dy. Ex. Engr. Representative of the licensee attended hearing. Minutes of the hearing including the submissions made by the parties are recorded and the same are kept in the record. Submissions made by the parties in respect of grievance since already recorded will be referred to avoid repetition.

- 5) The consumer has taken electricity connection from the Distribution Licensee (DL) to his shop in the year 1997. It is contended by the consumer that his consumption is very meager i.e. two tubes, one fan,

one pressing machine with 1 HP run on electricity thereby his monthly consumption is around 50 to 60 units and inspite of this he received bill for the month of Feb. 2010 of huge amount of consumption 2072 units. According to consumer this bill being excessive and incorrect he apprised the licensee by letter dt. 26/07/2010 to revise the bill but not responded, therefore he moved the I.G.R. Cell but in vain, hence lodged this grievance with prayer to direct the licensee to revise the bill.

- 6) Licensee vide reply dt. 17/01/2011 controverted the allegations leveled above. It is contended that since consumer's meter No. 0004435 was not recording consumption as per sanctioned load from Oct. 2009, it was replaced in Dec. 2009 by meter No. 2344096, and accordingly as per actual consumption bills were raised and issued including the bill under dispute. However consumer complained on incorrect consumption, therefore, this meter was also replaced in April 2010. It is contended that bill raised as per the meter No. 2344096 was as per actual consumption, consequently consumer is liable to pay the bill amount and he was informed accordingly, therefore question of revising the bill under dispute does not arise.
- 7) On perusal of the record and hearing both the parties following points arise for the consideration of Forum and findings thereon for the reasons recorded below :

Points	Findings
a)Whether the bill under dispute is excessive and incorrect ?	NO
b)What Order ?	As per Order below

**Reasons**

- 8) According to the consumer his consumption to the shop is around 50 to 60 units per month and accordingly he was getting bill and paying the same regularly. However, he received bill in the month of Feb. 2010 of 2072 units of the amount running in thousand is absolutely excessive and incorrect, needs to be revised. On perusal the record it is seen on the complaint of consumer his meter No. 2344096 was checked by the Section Engineer on 21/04/2010 and was showing recording as per actual consumption thereby the bill issued under dispute was as per actual consumption. This was informed by the licensee to the consumer on various occasions. This meter was replaced in April 2010, however, consumer was not satisfied with this change of meter in as much as bill remained unrevised.
- 9) Point before us whether the bill under dispute is as per the actual consumption. As stated above according to licensee bill was correctly raised and issued, therefore we directed the licensee to get the meter No. 2344096 rechecked and accordingly it was rechecked on 19/01/2011. This report filed on record dt. 19/01/2011 clearly indicate it was within permissible error limit at all loads. No ill will or bias is shown against the Meter Tester and that he has no reason to give false report. Meter Tester being a public servant acted in good faith, therefore report indicating that the meter was O.K. is to be believed. Now point crop on as to how bill under dispute on consumption of 2072 units came to be issued. Consumer has produced earlier and later bills showing average consumption within 50 to 60 units. At the same time point raise as to how meter recorded 2072 units. It is the right of the consumer to get the

bill of the correct amount. It is not that the meter No. 2344096 was checked once but it was checked twice, error may occur in testing once but not twice. Based on advance technique meter was checked in Lab. concur the earlier result. Under the circumstance possibility of more consumption by the consumer or at his instance cannot be ruled out and on this background considering the re-check report dt. 19/01/2011 we are constrained to hold that the bill raised and issued is as per the consumption of electricity and consumer is liable to pay the bill accordingly. In this view of the matter we find no force in the contention of the consumer and the grievance application since sans merits apt to be dismissed. Point is answered accordingly and hence the order :

### **ORDER**

- 1) Grievance application stands dismissed.
- 2) The Consumer can file representation against this decision with the Hon. Electricity Ombudsman within 60 days from the date of this order at the following address :

*“Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 606/608, Keshav Bldg, Bandra Kurla Complex, Mumbai 51”.*

Date : 21/02/2011

(R.V.Shivdas)  
Member Secretary  
CGRF Kalyan

(S.N. Saundankar)  
Chairperson  
CGRF Kalyan