CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM;

MSEDCL NAGPUR (RURAL) ZONE NAGPUR COMPLAINT NO. 10/2014

Shri H.G.Pateliya (on behalf of Shri K.T.Pateliya) Shivaji ward,Hinganghat District - Wardha.

Complainant

,,VS..

- 1. Executive Engineer, MSEDCL,O&M Division, Hinganghat.
- Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer,
 I. G. R. C., Circle Office,
 MSEDCL,Wardha.

Respondents

Applicant represented by
Respondents represented by1) Shri B.V.Betal, Authorized representative
1) Shri M.S.Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat
2) Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat (U)

CORAM:

Shri Vishnu S. Bute, Chairman. Adv. Gauri D. Chandrayan, Member Ms. S. B. Chiwande, Member-Secretary.

JUDGEMENT

(Delivered on this 14th day of March, 2014)

2. At present Shri K.T.Pateliya is a consumer. He is dead. One Shri H.G.Pateliya presented the application before the IGRC. Before this Forum also Shri H.G.Pateliya presented the application. So Shri H.G.Pateliya is hereinafter referred to as, the applicant. It is his contention that the meter installed at his residence is faulty. It is running fast. The respondent MSEDCL (hereinafter referred to as, the respondent) is not taking any cognizance of his complaints. Instead of giving any relief to him, the respondent issued a notice of disconnection to the applicant. The applicant approached

IGRC Wardha. The IGRC passed order under No.SE/Wardh/Tech/IGRC/540 dated 29-01-2014. Feeling dissatisfied with the aforesaid order the applicant presented instant application under the provisions contained in Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF and E.O.) Regulations 2006 on 20-02-2014.

3. A copy of the application was given to the respondent. The respondent was directed to submit parawise reply. The respondent submitted reply under no.EE/O&M /H'ghat/Tech/774 dated 28-02-2014. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 03-03-2014. Shri B.V.Betal, authorized representative was present for the applicant. Shri M.S.Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat & Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat (Urban), represented the respondent. Both the parties were heard.

4. Shri Betal argued for the applicant . He submitted following points for the consideration of the Forum,

i) The meter installed at the residence of the applicant was unnecessarily changed in November 2012. The meter installed thereafter was faulty. It was running fast. The applicant made complaints. However no cognizance was taken. The bills issued on the basis of this meter are wrong. The meter may be tested and revise bills may be issued.

ii) The respondent changed the meter in February 2013. The meter installed subsequently is also faulty. It is also running fast. So the bills issued on the basis of this meter are also wrong.

iii) Eventhough the meters were faulty & the applicant made complaints from time to time the respondent, instead of giving any relief, issued a notice for

disconnection. The number of the meter installed in February 2013 was 2077045. However the applicant issued the bills of meter bearing number 2077044. So all these bills may be quashed and set aside

5. .i) Shri Chavan replied for the respondent. It was stated that the meter installed at the residence of the applicant was electromagnetic meter. As per the policy of MSEDCL the meter was changed in November 2012. Thereafter meter number 98 / 00016477 was installed. The applicant made a complaint about this meter. So the meter was tested in the laboratory on 28-01-2014. The meter was found O.K. The test report is placed on record.

ii) In February 2013 meter number 58 / 02077045 was installed at his residence. The applicant is not paying the electricity charges regularly. Instead he is making complaints every now and then. So a notice for disconnection was issued to him. The respondent is ready to test the meter no. 2077045 in the presence of the applicant.

iii) The applicant is not paying the electricity bills regularly. Till December 2013 he is in arrears of Rs.34,456/-. So a notice for disconnection is issued to him.

iv) It is true that the serial number of the meter installed at the residence of applicant is 2077045.

However in the electricity bills it was wrongly mentioned as 2077044. But it can be seen from photograph which appear on the bill that the bill is calculated on the basis of the reading of meter, bearing serial number 2077045.

The applicant is not paying the electricity bills. Previous meter was tested & it was found to be O.K. The respondent is ready to test the meter presently installed at his residence on 04-03-2014 in his presence. So the application has no force. It may be dismissed.

6. We have perused the record. We have heard the arguments advanced by both the parties.

i) It is true that the electromagnetic meter was installed at the residence of the applicant. It was changed as per the policy of respondent company. However the applicant can not have any grievance about the meter unless it is found to be faulty.

ii) The meter installed in November 2012 bearing number 98 / 00016477 was tested on 28-01-2014. The meter was found O.K.

iii) The meter bearing number 58 / 02077045 was installed in February 2013.
The applicant was not satisfied with this meter also. So on 03-03-2014 the respondents were directed to test the meter in the presence of the applicant and his representative.
The respondent tested the meter on 04-03-2014. The applicant & his authorized representative was also present. The respondent submitted the copy of the test report.
The meter was found to be O.K.

iv) As per the applicant the meters installed at his residence were faulty. Eventhen the respondent insisted for payment of the electricity charges. Now after due verification it is found that the meters installed at the residence of the applicant were running properly.

The respondent produced the copy of the CPL of the applicant. On perusal of the same it is found that the applicant is not paying the electricity bills regularly. Naturally the action to issue the disconnection notice appears to be proper.

v) The applicant also raised the objection that the meter installed at the residence of the applicant was bearing number 2077045. However the respondent issued the bills of electricity of the meter bearing no.207744.

The applicant himself produced the Xerox copy of the bill of February 2014. The bill clearly show the meter number. It is 2077045. It also show that the current reading is taken properly. The Xerox copy of the bill of January 2014 is also on record. It also show that the current reading is recorded properly.

7. In view of the aforesaid discussion, it is clear that the applicant totally failed to establish his case. So we pass the following order.

<u>O R D E R</u>

- i) Application No.10 of 2014 is hereby dismissed.
- ii) The parties to bear their own cost.

Sd/-Sd/-Sd/-(Adv.Gauri D.Chandrayan)(Ms.S.B.Chiwande)(Vishnu S. Bute)MEMBERMEMBER SECRETARYCHAIRMANCONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM; NAGPUR ZONE NAGPUR(Nagpur Dtd.14th day of March, 2014)

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM

NAGPUR ZONE (RURAL) M. S. E. D. C. L.

Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni,

NAGPUR – 440013

Email.id- <u>cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in</u> cgrfnz@gmail.com (0) 0712- 2022198

NO. CGRF/NZ/

Date :

Certified copy of order dated 14th March, 2014 in Case No.10 / 2014 is

enclosed herewith.

Member-Secy/ Exe.Engineer, C.G.R.F.(NZ)MSEDCL <u>N A G P U R</u>

To,

Shri H.G.Pateliya (on behalf of Shri K.T.Pateliya), Shivaji ward, Hinganghat Dist.Wardha.

C<u>opy s.w.r.to :-</u>

1. The Chief Engineer(NZ), MSEDCL, Vidyut Bhavan, Katol Road, Nagpur.

Copy f.w.cs.to:

- 1. The Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer., O&M Circle Office, MSEDCL.Wardha
- 2. The Executive Engineer, C.C.O&M Dn., MSEDCL, Hinganghat for information and necessary action.

Address of the Electricity Ombudsman is given as below.

Office of - The Electricity Ombudsman,

12, Srikrupa, Vijay Nagar, Chhaoni, Nagpur-440 013 0712-2596670