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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/248/2014

Applicant : Late Shri Namdeorao V. Dhawade,

User:- Shri Pritesh S. Raut, New Shukrawari, Malipura,

Dasara Road, Nagpur : 32.

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 20.11.2014.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 25.9.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

Page 1 of 3 Case No. 248/14

- 2. The applicant's case in brief is that he received excessive bills. Therefore bills may be revised. I.G.R.C. passed order dated 12.9.2014. Being aggrieved by the said order he approached to this Forum.
- 3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 10.10.2014. It is submitted that meter was tested by acucheck on 5.9.2014 and it is found O.K. Learned I.G.R.C. passed order and as per this order meter is replaced and new meter is installed. Old meter is tested in the laboratory and it is found O.K. Therefore bills can not be revised.
- 4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.
- Name of the consumer is Late Namdeorao V. Dhawade, who died before 20 years. There is no application for change of name since last 20 years. Present application is filed by one Shri Pritesh S. Raut. He argued that he is also residing at Kalmeshwar. Deceased Namdeorao is father of his maternal uncle. Therefore signatory to this application is very remote and he is not the consumer within meaning of section 2(15) of Electricity Act 2003. Son, daughter or wife of deceased consumer Shri Namdeorao is not appearing before this Forum for filing the application or to argue. Hence applicant has no locusstandi.
- 6. Furthermore, in the month of May 2014 and June 2014 status was Inaccessible. In the month of July 2014 reading was 719 units but it was for 3 months. If we peruse reading of April 2013, May 2013 & June 2013, reading is 379, 419 and 540 units respectively. Therefore reading of July 2014 & August 2014 is not excessive. Spot inspection report shows

Page 2 of 3 Case No. 248/14

that there is sufficient load in this house of 4 rooms. In our opinion at the most slab benefit can be given to the applicant for 3 months. Hence following order:-

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) Slab benefit for 3 months i.e. April, May & June 2014 be given to the applicant and accordingly bills be revised.
- 3) Compliance should be submitted within 30 days from the date of this order.

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

Page 3 of 3 Case No. 248/14