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

## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/65/2014

Applicant : Shri Gurumukhsingh A. Hans,

Plot No. M-21, Sugat Nagar,

Nari Road, Nagpur : 26.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,

The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee),

MSEDCL,

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Vishnu S. Bute,

Chairman.

NAGPUR.

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar

Member.

3) Shri B.A. Wasnik, Member Secretary.

## ORDER PASSED ON 25.3.2014.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 5.3.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

Page 1 of 3 Case No. 651/14

- 2. The applicant's case in brief is that applicant is commercial consumer of non applicant, bearing Consumer No. 410012135002. He has been receiving excessive bills since replacement of old meter. Even then non applicant has informed that the meter is O.K. The consumer approached I.G.R.C. However, I.G.R.C. rejected the grievance application of the consumer by order dated 10.1.2014. Hence consumer filed present grievance application before this Forum for revision of excessive bill.
- 3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 18.3.2014. It is submitted that consumer is being issued energy bills as per meter reading. On receipt of complaint from the consumer that he is receiving excessive bills; his meter No. 65/03007468 was tested with acucheck on 3.8.2013 and meter was found O.K. The consumer has approached to I.G.R.C. Learned I.G.R.C. rejected the grievance application of applicant by order dated 18.2.2014. As such Grievance application may be dismissed.
- 4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.
- 5. C.P.L. of the applicant shows that the meter is not replaced since long and the same meter is continued for about two years. The average consumption of the applicant for the previous year is about 220 units per month which is normal and can not be called as excessive. As such there is no need for revision in the bills.

Page 2 of 3 Case No. 651/14

6. For these reasons, Forum proceeds to pass following order: -

## ORDER

1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/(B.A. Wasnik) (Adv. Subhash Jichkar) (Vishnu S. Bute),
MEMBER MEMBER CHAIRMAN
SECRETARY

Page 3 of 3 Case No. 651/14