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

## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/239/2014

Applicant : Shri Sheshrao Pandhari Kharkar,

Plot No. 13, Govind Prabhu Nagar,

Dighori, 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 15.11.2014.

- 1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 18.9.2014 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 he received excessive bill of June 2014 & July 2014. Therefore bills may be revised. I.G.R.C. passed order dated 10.9.2014 & directed Commercial Manager to replace disputed

Page 1 of 3 Case No. 239/14

meter and to test it in meter testing laboratory in presence of the applicant and to take further action on disputed bills if so necessitated as per the findings of laboratory testing results. Being aggrieved by the said order applicant approached this Forum.

- Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 4.10.2014. It is submitted that meter was tested by acucheck on 25.8.2014 and it is found O.K. He approached to Learned I.G.R.C. & Learned I.G.R.C. passed order dated 10.9.2014. As per the order of Learned I.G.R.C. old meter is replaced and new meter is installed. Old meter is tested in meter testing laboratory on 18.9.2014 in presence of the applicant and it is found O.K. Therefore bills can not be revised.
- 4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.
- 5. We have carefully perused meter testing report Dt. 25.8.2014 and meter is found O.K. Therefore it is clear that consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilised by the applicant. We have also carefully perused another testing report Dt. 18.9.2014 in meter testing laboratory. As per this meter testing report meter is found O.K. Therefore meter is not faulty. There is spot inspection report Dt. 4.10.2014 on record which shows that there are 2 TVs, 1 freeze, 3 fans, one table fan, 2 motor pumps, 7 CFLs, 5 lights. During the course of arguments applicant frankly admitted that there are 3 rooms occupied by the applicant and consumption shown in spot inspection report is the consumption of 3 three rooms. Applicant further admitted in clear terms that there are other 3 rooms occupied by brother of the applicant and electricity line is taken from meter of the applicant in 3 rooms of his brother. However, load of the brother of applicant is separate. It is not Page 2 of 3 Case No. 239/14

mentioned in spot inspection report. Forum made specific query what is the connected load of his brother. Applicant was unable to tell because those 3 rooms are separate. Therefore it is clear that load shown in spot inspection report is load of the applicant and load of his brother is in addition which is not noted in spot inspection report. It is also not mentioned in spot inspection report that there are how many rooms. Therefore it is possible that brother of the applicant is consuming excessive energy and therefore there is more consumption. Applicant argued that his brother utilised excessive energy and both the brothers have to pay the electricity bill 50-50, but his brother do not bother.

6. If it is a fact, then there can not be any blame on the meter. Proper remedy is to bifurcate the load by taking 2 different meters. Therefore brother of the applicant is at liberty to apply for separate meter and in such circumstances, both the brothers shall not be able to blame each other for utilizing excessive energy. Meter is O.K. Therefore bills can not be revised. Hence Forum proceeds to pass following order:

## ORDER

1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-(Anil Shrivastava) MEMBER SECRETARY Sd/-(Adv. Subhash Jichkar) MEMBER Sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil), CHAIRMAN

Page 3 of 3 Case No. 239/14