CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM;

MSEDCL NAGPUR (RURAL) ZONE NAGPUR COMPLAINT NO. 63/2013

Shri Kamlakar Gulabrao Ugemuge Kaji ward, Kamlakar pan vilas, Opposite Bus stand, Hinganghat District - Wardha.

Complainant

,,VS..

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

Respondents

Applicant represented by

- 1) Shri B.V.Betal
- Respondents represented by 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 12th day of August, 2013)

2. Shri Kamlakar Gulabrao Ugemuge R/o.Hinganghat (hereinafter referred to as, the applicant) is a commercial consumer. It is alleged that the distribution licensee MSEDCL (hereinafter referred to as, the respondent) has issued him a wrong and excessive bill for the month of June 2012. The applicant approached the IGRC Wardha. His application was decided by an order passed in case no.SE/Wardha/Tech/IGRC/2509 dated 26-04-2013. Feeling dissatisfied with the order the applicant submitted this application under the provisions contained in Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & E.O.) Regulations 2006.

- 3. A notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent submitted reply under no.EE/O&M/H'ghat/Tech/3849 dated 30-07-2013. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 07-08-2013. Shri B.V.Betal, authorized representative, represented the applicant. Shri M.S.Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat and Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat (Urban) were present for the respondents. Both the parties were heard.
- 4. Shri Betal argued for the applicant that the respondent gave wrong and excessive bill of 524 units in the month of June 2012. The applicant filed an application for correction of bill on 26-06-2012. However no cognizance was taken. The applicant deposited meter testing fee. After 4 to 5 months Shri Madame, Junior Engineer, came and tested the meter by Accucheck machine. Shri Madame, told that the meter is defective. However the applicant has not been given the test report. The meter was changed. The new meter installed in premises of the applicant is also defective. It is running fast.

The applicant prayed that the penal interest imposed on the arrears may be quashed. Revised bills may be given to the applicant for the period Feb 2013 to July 2013.

5. Shri Vaidya and Shri G.C.Chavan represented the respondents. The respondent denied the allegations. It was stated that the meter reading for the month of May 2012 could not be taken. So an average bill of 96 units was given to the applicant. The consumption of 524 units pertains to the months of May & June 2012. As per the CPL, the consumption of the applicant, in the same period is as under,

Month	Apr.12	May.12	June 12	July 12	
Consumption	97	96	524	172	793 Units
		(Average)	(Two months)		
Month	Apr.13	May 13	June 13	July 13	
Consumption	102	166	276	165	709 Units

On an average the bill given is proper.

The meter was tested. It was noticed that the meter is working properly. The applicant again made a complaint about the second / new meter. It was also tested on 19-07-2013. The meter is o.k. In view of the aforesaid position 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.

The applicants complaint is about the bill of June 2012. The bill is of 524 units. However the applicant has not given any satisfactory explanation as to why the bill is wrong. On the contrary the respondents stated that the meter reading of the month of May 2012 was not received. So the bill for May 2012 was given on average basis, showing the consumption of 96 units. Thereafter actual reading was available in June 2012. It was of 524 units. The respondent produced the copy of the bill issued in the month of June 2012. There is a note on the bill that the bill is of 2 months. The respondent further stated that meter was tested. The report is filed on record. It show that the meter is ok.

The respondents also produced a note showing the consumption of the applicant during the period Apr. 2012 to July 2012 and Apr. 2013 to July 2013. On an average the consumption is in the same range. So in absence of any cogent evidence, it is not possible to accept the oral allegations of the applicant.

The applicant also stated that the second / new meter is also defective. However as per the respondent, the meter was tested and it was found to be correct.

In light of the above discussion we are unable to accept any of the submission of the applicant. So we pass the following order.

<u>ORDER</u>

 Application No.63 of 2013 has no force and is dismissed with no order as to cost.

Sd/(Adv.Gauri D.Chandrayan) (Ms.S.B.Chiwande) (Vishnu S. Bute)

MEMBER MEMBER SECRETARY CHAIRMAN

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM; NAGPUR ZONE NAGPUR

(Nagpur Dtd.12th day of August, 2013)

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM

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

Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni, NAGPUR – 440013

Email.id- cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in

(O) 0712-2022198

cgrfnz@gmail.com

NO. CGRF/NZ/ Date :

Certified copy of order dated 12th August,,2013 in Case No.63 / 2013 is enclosed herewith.

Member-Secy/ Exe.Engineer, C.G.R.F.(NZ)MSEDCL NAGPUR

To,

Shri Kamlakar Gulabrao Ugemuge, Kaji ward, Kamlakar pan Vilas, Opposite Bus stand, Hinganghat , Dist.Wardha

Copy s.w.r.to :-

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