



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

No. **K/E/1081/1302 of 2016-17**

Date of Grievance : 18/11/2016

Date of order : 28/12/2016

Total days : 41

IN THE MATTER CASE OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/1081/1302/2016-17 IN RESPECT OF VATSALA PANDURANG PATIL, KALYAN (W), THANGEWADI, PARDESI CHAWL, ROOM NO.2, PIN CODE 421 301, REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN REGARDING BILLING DISPUTE.

Smt.Vatsala Pandurang Patil,
Kalyan (W), Thangewadi,
Pardesi Chawl, Room No.2,
Pin Code 421 301

Consumer No. 020020308223) (Hereinafter referred as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited
Addl. Executive Engineer,
MSEDCL, Kalyan Circle-I

..... (Hereinafter referred as Licensee)

Appearance : - For Licensee : Shri V.D.Yadav -EE-Kalyan Circle-I.
For Consumer : In person.

[Coram- Shri A.M.Garde-Chirperson, Shri L.N.Bade-Member Secretary and
Mrs.S.A.Jamdar- Member (CPO)].

Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, is, constituted u/s. 82 of Electricity Act 2003 (36/2003). Hereinafter for the sake of brevity referred as 'MERC'. This Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established as per the notification issued by MERC i.e.

“Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2006” to redress the grievances of consumers vide powers conferred on it by Section 181 read with sub-section 5 to 7 of section 42 of the Electricity Act, (36/2003). Hereinafter it is referred as ‘Regulation’. Further the regulation has been made by MERC i.e. ‘Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission. Hereinafter referred as ‘Supply Code’ for the sake of brevity. Even, regulation has been made by MERC i.e. ‘Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Standards of Performance of Distribution Licensees, Period for Giving Supply & Determination of Compensation) Regulations, 2014.’ Hereinafter referred ‘SOP’ for the sake of convenience (Electricity Supply Code and other conditions of supply) Regulations 2014’.

2] Brief facts of the grievance application are that:

The consumer is having a residential connection since 17/10/1983 and was paying the electricity bills regularly. It is the contention of the consumer that earlier she was availing electricity supply from meter No.12194365 of Rolex make. This meter was in existence from **September 2014 to November 2014**. However, this meter was changed by Licensee as this lot of Rolex meter was showing less consumption due to its slowness, causing revenue loss. Hence as per the directions of Licensee’s Higher Authorities, the Rolex meter was changed in December 2014 and Palmohan make Meter was installed. The consumer was getting supply from this meter till June 2016. However, the consumer was having a lot of complaints regarding this meter. Licensee on the request of consumer acue checked the meter on 4/8/16 and found OK. Even Licensee tried to

connect HPL make meter in series as per consumer's request on 8/8/16. Licensee found the consumption shown by both the meters is same.

3] The main grievance of the consumer is that she was receiving exorbitant bills after the replacement of Rolex meter. One more contention of the consumer is that photo image and reading on the electricity bill is not legible. Consumer, therefore, approached IGRC with a prayer to replace the meter and revise the bills.

4] Not satisfied with the order of IGRC, consumer approached this Forum on **23/11/2016** and requested to change / check the meter and revise the bills.

5] In this connection consumer pleaded that after the replacement of Rolex meter she started getting incorrect bills. Consumer further contended that there are no photo images on the electricity bills. Even the reading in the photo image is not legible. Consumer also raised the question as to whether the meter reading has been correctly and honestly noted down by the meter reader. However, consumer did not spell out about the defective meter. On the contrary, Licensee offered to test the disputed meter in the Lab for which consumer was not ready. Even at the time of hearing Forum asked the consumer whether she wanted to get the meter tested in the Lab but consumer was reluctant. It was also revealed that once the meter was Lab checked and was found OK, the consumer admitted to the said fact.

6] Licensee in its reply / submission, stated that there was no excess recording. On the request of the consumer, her meter was tested and old meter was replaced. Licensee further submitted that image of photo not appearing on the bill cannot escape the consumer from paying the bills. Consumer's earlier meter (Rolex meter) was changed due to slowness in

the entire lot and revenue loss. After replacement of this meter, the consumer started getting the bill as per her consumption and hence bills cannot be revised.

7] We have gone through the record and submission made by both the parties and our observation are :-

a] CPL prior to installation of Rolex meter shows that the consumption pattern of consumer was on an average 300 units. Due to some technical problem (as Explained in Para above) Rolax meter was changed and Palmohan make meter was installed. On the complaint of consumer Licensee took investigation of the meter. The Officials checked the meter. The said meter was also compared with another meter for observation and there was no difference in the reading of both the meters. Licensee tried to sort out the problem of consumer by replacing the meter.

b] We have also noted that in the CPL from 2013-2016, no excess reading is shown by the meter. On the request of the consumer, Licensee checked the meter two times. Officials of the Licensee also replaced the meter on the complaint of the consumer and tried to give relief to the consumer. We have also observed that there is no sudden spurt in the reading prior and subsequent to installation of Rolex meter i.e. after replacement of old meter.

c] We have also noted that the bills produced by the consumer at the time of hearing do not show photo of the meter and the reading is also not legible . However, taking in to the consideration, the electric appliance (02 tubes, 02 geezers, 06 fans , 01 TV, 01 Mixture, LED light , one adjustable fan) used by the consumer, we feel that the bills issued to the consumer are as per the consumption. Hence, non visibility of photo image on the bill cannot excuse consumer for non payment of bills. Moreover,

the previous readings and the current readings are almost same. Hence, we feel that exorbitant bills are not issued to the consumer.

8] It is the fact that the image of photo reading appearing on the electricity bills is an additional facility given by the Licensee, however, we opine that the Licensee henceforth should take care while issuing the electricity bills to the consumer and ascertain that a proper photo image of the meter and a legible reading appear on the electricity bills of the consumer.

Hence the order.

ORDER

Grievance application of the consumer is hereby rejected.

Dated: 28/12/2016.

(Mrs.S.A.Jamdar)
Member
CGRF, Kalyan

(L.N.Bade)
Member Secretary
CGRF, Kalyan

(A.M.Garde)
Chairperson
CGRF, Kalyan

NOTE

- a) The consumer if not satisfied, may file representation against this order before the Hon. 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”.
- b) Consumer, as per section 142 of the Electricity Act, 2003, can approach Hon. Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission for non-compliance, part compliance or
- c) delay in compliance of this decision issued under “Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2003” at the following address:-
“Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 13th floor, World Trade Center, Cuffe Parade, Colaba, Mumbai 05”
- d) It is hereby informed that if you have filed any original documents or important papers you have to take it back after 90 days. Those will not be available after three years as per MERC Regulations and those will be destroyed.

