

**Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s  
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum  
Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur**

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/153/2014**

Applicant : Late Shri Govindrao B. Buradkar,  
Thr:- Shri Arun G. Buradkar,  
Behind Chitnispura Police Station,  
Nandajinagar, Mahal,  
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,  
The Superintending Engineer,  
(Distribution Franchisee),  
MSEDCL, N.U.C.,  
NAGPUR.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,  
Chairman.  
  
2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar  
Member.  
  
3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,  
Member / Secretary.

**ORDER PASSED ON 5.8.2014.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 21.6.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. The applicant's case in brief is that after replacement of old meter by new meter, he is receiving excessive bills since April 2013 and therefore requested to revise the bill. He filed grievance application before I.G.R.C. Learned I.G.R.C. partly allowed the grievance application as per order dated 14.4.2014. Being aggrieved

by the said order, he filed present grievance application before this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 11.7.2014. It is submitted that old meter of the applicant was replaced in April 2013. Old meter was tested in meter testing laboratory on 17.8.2013 and again checked on 30.12.2013 in presence of the applicant and it is found O.K. Applicant filed grievance application before I.G.R.C. Learned I.G.R.C. ordered to replace the old meter and test the meter in meter testing laboratory. Accordingly, old meter was replaced by new meter and old meter was tested in the meter testing laboratory on 23.4.2014 in presence of the applicant and it is found O.K. Therefore grievance application may be dismissed.

4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.

5. Learned I.G.R.C. passed order dt. 14.4.2014, in case No. 247/14 and directed the Commercial Manager to replace the old meter and test it in meter testing laboratory invariably in presence of the applicant and to take further action on disputed bills if so necessitated as per laboratory testing report. Thereafter old meter of the applicant was replaced by new meter and old meter was tested in meter testing laboratory in presence of the applicant on 23.4.2014 and it is found O.K. We have carefully perused meter testing report Dt. 23.4.2014. It is duly signed by the applicant in English alongwith his mobile number. As per this meter testing report, the meter is O.K. Therefore consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption

utilised by the applicant and hence there is no scope for revision of bill.

6. We have carefully perused order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. It is correct, legal and valid. It is in fact balanced order. As per the order of Learned I.G.R.C., the old meter was replaced by new meter and that meter is tested in the laboratory and it is found O.K. Therefore there is no need for interference in legal order passed by Learned I.G.R.C.

7. It is pertinent to note that during the course of hearing it was ordered by the Forum on 15.7.2014, directing SNDL to file spot inspection report on record and to verify whether there are two meters in this premises. M/s. SPANCO filed spot inspection report on record Dt. 16.7.2014. We have carefully perused this spot inspection report. It is rather surprising to note that this spot inspection report dt. 16.7.2014 appears to be manipulated by concerned employee of SNDL. The load existing in the premises is not shown in spot inspection report but attempted to show less load than existing load in the premises. The things and points which ought to have been mentioned in spot inspection report are intentionally suppressed and the things which are not in the knowledge of the inspecting person i.e. employee of SNDL are unnecessarily mentioned in the spot inspection report with a dishonest intention to help the consumer. During the course of hearing, we have verified to the applicant consumer personally and he told that there are two floors to the building. There are two meters, one is installed on the ground floor and another installed on first floor. On the ground floor, there are 4 rooms and on the first floor there are 4 rooms. Two different tenants are residing on first floor.

The applicant consumer is residing with his family on the ground floor. So far as the consumption of the applicant for ground floor is concerned, he admitted following load :-

1. Fan - 4
2. CFL - 4
3. T.V. - 1
4. Set top box-1
5. Freeze- 1
6. Cooler- 1
7. Mixer- 1
8. Iron - 1
9. Tube light- 2

8. However, in the spot inspection report, the concerned employee of SNDL has mentioned number of buttons only. At the bottom, it is mentioned "One room locked not in use, used by cousin who is out of station for another purpose". At the bottom of this report, it is mentioned that "used meter for first floor in the premises". In fact, whether room is locked or open, it is not necessary to be mentioned in the spot inspection report. Inspecting person i.e. employee of SNDL can not have any personally knowledge much less definite knowledge whether room is permanently locked, whether it is occupied by cousin and whether cousin brother is out of station and for what purpose. These unwanted things are unnecessarily mentioned in spot inspection report. Secondly, 3 buttons + 3 buttons+ 8 buttons +2 buttons + 6 buttons + 2 buttons + 4 buttons are mentioned in the column of load. In our considered opinion, this spot inspection report appears to be manipulated by the concerned employee of SNDL on the say of consumer to favour him. It is pertinent to note that this spot inspection report is signed by SHRI SURAJ MISHRA. It is noteworthy that in many other cases, this Forum has observed that this employee of SNDL "SURAJ MISHRA' is manipulating the spot inspection report and has habit to mention

incorrect information and less load than the load which is existing. Therefore, it is necessary to take departmental action against the said Suraj Mishra who is signatory to spot inspection report Dt. 16.7.2014 and to take action against guilty person.

9. For these reasons, we hold that meter is O.K. and therefore there is no need to revise the bill. We find no force in grievance application and application deserves to be dismissed. Hence Forum proceeds to pass the following order :-

#### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.
- 2) Business head of SNDL is hereby directed to conduct disciplinary enquiry against Shri Suraj Mishra who is signatory to spot inspection report Dt. 16.7.2014 and to take suitable departmental action against defaulter person..
- 3) Non applicant to submit compliance report within 30 days from the date of this order.

Sd/-  
(Anil Shrivastava)  
MEMBER  
SECRETARY

Sd/-  
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Shivajirao S. Patil),  
CHAIRMAN