

**Before Maharashtra State Electricity Board's
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur**

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/013/2005

Applicant : Sau. Shashikala Jagdish Sakarde,
Ward No. 1, New Bina,
Bhonegaon, Post, Khaparkheda,
Tq. Saoner, Dist. Nagpur.

Non-Applicant : Assistant Engineer,
MSEB, O&M Dn. – II,
NAGPUR -The Nodal Officer

Quorum Present : 1) Shri S.D. Jahagirdar, IAS (Retd)
Chairman,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,
Member,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 27.04.2005)

The present application is filed before this Forum in the prescribed schedule "A" on 30.03.2005 as per Regulation No. 6.3 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2003 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The grievance of the applicant is in respect of non-provision of new electricity connection for her house.

The matter was heard by us on 26.04.2005 when both the parties were present. The applicant was represented by her husband Shri Jagdish Wamanrao Sakarde who was heard by us. The non-applicant was also heard by us. Documents produced by both the parties are also perused by us.

After receipt of the grievance application, the non-applicant was asked to furnish parawise remarks on the applicant's application in terms of Regulation numbers 6.7 and 6.8 of the said Regulations. The non-applicant, accordingly, submitted to this Forum his parawise remarks on 15.04.2005. A copy of this parawise report was given to the applicant's representative on 26.04.2005 before the case was taken up for hearing and opportunity was given to him to present the case on behalf of the applicant on this parawise report also.

It is the contention of the applicant that she applied to the Assistant Engineer concerned on 05.10.2001 with a request to release new electricity connection for her house. The electricity connection sought for by her is not released although a period of more than three years has elapsed since the date of her application. The applicant's representative contended that the applicant has filed application addressed to the Chief Engineer concerned, being application dated 09.03.2004, another application dated 29.03.2003 and also application dated 19.05.2005 for redressal of her grievance. However, no remedy was provided to her grievance. The applicant had also endorsed copies of

these applications to the Assistant Engineer, S/Dn. Khaparkheda and also Executive Engineer, Division No. – II Nagpur of MSEB. The applicant has also filed one more application, being application dated 16.04.2003, addressed to the Assistant Engineer, S/Dn. Office Khaparkheda, Tq. Saoner, Dist. Nagpur with a similar request but to no purpose. The applicant's representative further contended that the applicant has also paid the amount of Rs. 4,750/- on 17.06.2002 as per the demand note dated 03.06.2002 given to the applicant by the Jr. Engineer of Khaparkheda S/Dn. Office of MSEB. However, no further action was taken by the concerned Engineer of MSEB for releasing electricity connection to the applicant. The applicant's representative has also produced copies of news paper cuttings in which the subject-matter of the grievance is published. The applicant's representative has requested that the MSEB Officials be directed to release new electricity connection to the applicant's house as already sought for by the applicant way back in October, 2001.

The non-applicant has stated in his parawise report dated 13.03.2005 that the applicant did apply to the Jr. Engineer of Khaparkheda town for releasing new electricity connection to her house. Accordingly, an estimate was prepared by the Jr. Engineer under the Out-right Contribution Scheme which was approved by the Division Office of Nagpur Rural Division. This estimate was sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, Nagpur Rural Circle under his order dated 23.03.2002. There upon, as per

this estimate, the applicant was asked to pay to MSEB an amount of Rs.4,750/- towards 50% supervision charges and also connection charges. Accordingly, the applicant paid this amount on 17.06.2002. However, the sanctioned work was not carried out by the applicant and hence new electricity connection sought for by applicant could not be released.

On being asked by us, the non-applicant could not show to us details of the estimate sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer.

We have carefully gone through the entire record of the case, all the documents produced by both the parties as also all the submissions made by both of them before us.

The limited grievance of the applicant is about non-provision of new electricity connection to the applicant's house.

The applicant's representative has contended that the applicant had applied to the concerned Engineer of MSEB way back in October 2001. He has further contended before us that the Assistant Engineer one Shri Kolte has been asking the applicant to pay an amount of Rs. 14,000/- so as to enable him to do the applicant's work. There is no dispute about the fact that the applicant has paid the demand note amount of Rs. 4,750/- on 17.06.2002. Perusal of the contents of this demand note reveals that the demand note amount of Rs. 4,750/- includes the cost of RS. 1750/- towards 50% supervision charges, amount of Rs.1000/- towards service connection charges, security deposit of

Rs. 1000/- and also cost of Rs. 1000/- towards cost of meter and also the cost towards service line charges.

During the course of hearing the applicant's representative vehemently argued that only one additional pole is necessary for the purpose of supplying electricity to the applicant's house. The non-applicant on being questioned by us admitted that this say of the applicant is correct. The non-applicant further contended that the applicant should file an affidavit on a stamp-paper of Rs. 20/- signed by the owner of the house namely one Shri Raut whose house is just adjacent to the applicant's house to the effect that he has no objection to lay the over-head service wire from the open space of his plot so that the service wire can be connected from the existing pole to the house of the applicant via one additional pole which is required to be erected at the corner point of the house of Shri Raut. On being further questioned by us, the non-applicant replied that the cost of one pole to be installed would be Rs. 1000/-. The non-applicant further stated that the applicant will be required to pay additional cost for the extended service wire if its total length exceeds thirty meters. The applicant thereupon stated that the total length of the service wire shall not exceed thirty meter. The non-applicant has, during the course of hearing, assured us that the entire work of erection of a new pole and connecting the applicant's house by service wire from the existing pole via the new pole to be erected will be completed before 30.04.2005 provided that

the applicant pays the amount of Rs. 1000/- towards the cost of erection of the new pole and also the additional cost of the service wire, if required. The applicant's representative, on his part, has shown his willingness to file the affidavit of the owner of the adjacent house and also to make payment of Rs. 1000/- towards the cost of erection of new pole and also the cost of service wire if the total length of the service line exceeds thirty meters as suggested by the non-applicant.

Although the detailed estimate referred to by the non-applicant was not produced before us, there seems to be no propriety in carrying out the work as per this estimate in view of the low cost solution suggested & agreed to by the non-applicant.

In view of this position, the applicant's grievance can be redressed forth-with and in any case before 30.04.2005 as agreed to by both the parties.

Looking to the new arrangement voluntarily proposed and agreed to by the non-applicant, a question now arises as to why the grievance of the applicant was not redressed when apt solution as suggested by the non-applicant was very much available in the past also. This demonstrates that avoidable hardship was caused to the applicant and for no tangible reasons, providing new electricity connection to the applicant's house was delayed for months and years on one pretext or the other. We expect the

MSEB officials to understand in proper perspective consumer's grievances and to redress them by acting promptly by suggesting low cost solutions wherever possible. Although the delay caused in the instant case is deplorable, we appreciate the non-applicant's gesture of providing on-the-spot solution and keeping the cost as low as possible.

It is also pertinent to note in this case that the applicant has filed several applications right from the year 2001 to various authorities including the Chief Engineer concerned. The applicant's first application addressed to the Chief Engineer, Nagpur Rural Zone, Nagpur is dated 09.03.2004 which was duly received by the office of the Chief Engineer on 09.03.2004. The Chief Engineer could have sent this application to the Internal Grievance Redressal Unit working under the supervision of the Superintending Engineer concerned. However, unfortunately this does not seem to have been done. The applicant was, therefore compelled to approach this Forum under the said Regulations since no remedy was provided to her grievance by the Internal Grievance Redressal Unit which works under the control of the concerned Chief Engineer.

We make a fervent appeal to the Chief Engineer to ensure that such grievances of the electricity consumers addressed to him are religiously forwarded to the appropriate Internal Grievance Redressal Units so that speedy remedy would be available to the aggrieved consumers. The intention of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission

behind enacting the said Regulations should be properly understood by all the concerned officials of the MSEB including the Chief Engineer and they should in fact help implementing provisions of the said Regulations in proper spirit.

In the light of above, we accept the grievance application of the applicant and pass the following order :

The applicant shall forth-with pay amount of Rs. 1000/- towards the cost of erection of one new pole as suggested by the non-applicant. The applicant shall also pay additional cost of service wire if its total length from the point from where the electricity supply is drawn up to the point at which the supply is made exceeds thirty meters as suggested by the non-applicant. The non-applicant shall ensure that supply of electricity to the applicant's house is actually commissioned on or before 30.04.2005 as per the solution voluntarily proposed and agreed to by him.

Both the parties shall act diligently and report compliance of this order before 2nd May 2005.

(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)
MEMBER

(S.D. Jahagirdar)
CHAIRMAN

**M.S.E.B.'S CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL
FORUM, NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.**