

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/022/2008

Applicant : Shri Vinodkumar P. Kewalramani
At B/130, Kamal Phool Chowk,
Jaripatka,
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : MSEDCL through
the Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
Civil Lines Division, NUZ,
Nagpur.

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

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

3) Shri S.J. Bhargawa
Executive Engineer &
Member Secretary,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 11.04.2008)

This grievance application is filed on 19.03.2008
under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity
Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal

Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The limited grievance of the applicant is in respect of allegedly wrong and excessive energy bill for the month of June, 2007 amounting to Rs.16,708.88.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant has filed his complaint on the same subject-matter before the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (in short, the Cell) under the said Regulations and the Cell, upon enquiry and hearing, informed the applicant by its letter, being letter no. 0381 dated 17.01.2008, that the applicant's meter was checked with accucheck upon receiving the applicant's complaint of excessive billing and that upon accucheck inspection, the meter was found to be Ok. The Cell further informed the applicant that the applicant has installed and made use of air conditioners in his premises during May and June 2007 and because of this position, the applicant's consumption was high. The Cell came to conclusion that the applicant's energy bill needs no revision. It is against this decision of the Cell that the applicant has filed this grievance application under the said Regulations.

The matter was heard on 05.04.2008 and 10.04.2008.

The applicant's case was presented before this Forum by his nominated representative one Shri Shailendra Kewalramani while the Dy. Executive Engineer, Civil Lines Division, NUZ, Nagpur and his UDC represented the non-applicant Company.

The applicant's representative's contention is that the applicant has been paying all his energy bills regularly till June 2006 and that his consumption per month till then was correctly reflected in his bills from time to time. To his shock & surprise, he received erroneous and excessive energy bill for 2700 units in the month of June 2007. He submitted that this consumption was indeed very exorbitant and it was not commensurate with his monthly pattern of consumption. Therefore, he made a complaint to the concerned Jr. Engineer. He was then asked to pay provisional amount of Rs.11,000/- which he paid on 01.11.2007. He disputed before the concerned Exe. Engineer by his application dated 06.11.2007 that his energy bill for June 2006 was wrong and excessive and requested him to revise this bill appropriately. The applicant paid amount of Rs.11,000/- under pressure from the non-applicant with a view to avoid disconnection of power supply. Since his bill was not revised, he made a complaint to the Cell on 19.12.2007. The Cell rejected his request stating that the applicant's meter was found to be Ok upon accu-check inspection.

He requested this Forum to revise his bill appropriately considering his average monthly pattern of consumption.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise report dated 04.04.2008 which is on record. A copy of this report was given to the applicant and he was given opportunity to offer his say on this report.

The non-applicant has stated that the disputed bill in question needs no revision since the applicant's meter was

found to be Ok. upon accucheck inspection. The report further states that the non-applicant's staff reported to the Executive Engineer that the applicant had installed air-conditioners during the months of May and June 2007 for trial purposes and the excessive bill might be the result of that. It is his strong submission that the applicant was billed according to his metered consumption and as such, there is no need to revise the bill. He prayed that the grievance application may be rejected.

Commenting upon the non-applicant's parawise report, the applicant during the course of hearing denied that any air-conditioners were installed at his premises during the months of May and June 2007. He maintained that the energy bill in question for 2700 units is improper, unjust and illegal. He added that the accucheck inspection of his meter was not carried out in his presence.

On hearing both the parties, a decision was taken by this Forum with the consent of both the parties to get the applicant's meter tested in the Testing Division of Exe. Engr. (T), NUZ. Accordingly the meter, being meter no. 104987, was tested on 08.04.2008 in the presence of the applicant by the Testing Dn., NUZ. A report dated 08.04.2008 has been filed on record which is among the case papers. This report states that the applicant's meter was found to be running slow by 6.54%. The applicant did not offer any comments on this report during hearing on 10.04.2008.

In this case, this Forum observes that upon receiving the applicant's complaint, his meter was tested on the spot at the applicant's premises by accucheck method on

07.09.2007 and the meter was found to be Ok. The report clearly states that reading taken in June 2007 is correct but as per the trend of consumption, previous readings were not taken correctly by meter reader and hence, the accumulation of units. The report recommended that slab benefit should be given to the applicant.

The applicant has contended that this accu-check meter was not done in his presence. However, the accu-check spot inspection report cannot be negated on this count. The applicant also did not press for testing of his meter immediately after June, 2007.

The applicant has produced a zerox copy of the accu-check inspection report. This zerox copy does not bear the Jr. Engineer's signature while the original report does bear Jr. Engineer's signatures at two places. There is an evidence of erasing the Jr. Engineer's signatures at two places in the zerox copy produced by the applicant. The signatures of Jr. Engineer are clearly erased by pasting strips of blank papers on the original zerox of the report. The applicant during the course of hearing did not also comment upon aspect of absence of signature of the Jr. Engineer. It is not his contention that the report does not bear the Jr. Engineer's signature. The zerox copy produced by him cannot, therefore, be accepted.

Moreover, the applicant's meter was also got tested as per Forum's order on 08.04.2008 in the presence of the applicant by the Dy. Exe. Executive (T) Dn., NUZ and it was found upon testing that the applicant's meter is running slow by 6.54%.

The applicant's meter was also not found to be faulty through out at least upto & inclusive of June, 2007. Looking to the facts of the case, this Forum observes that the disputed bill in question needs no revision. It seems that the observation made by the inspecting Jr. Engineer on 07.09.2007 at the time of accu-check inspection that previous readings were not recorded correctly by the meter reader seems to be correct. At the time of accu-check inspection, the working of the meter was found to be Ok and as such, there is no reason to the revise the disputed bill in question. As a matter of fact, subsequent test report dated 08.04.2008 is showing error of (-6.54%) after test was carried as per testing parameters.

Moreover, on comparison with the past trend of consumption as per the applicant's CPL, it is revealed that the applicant's average per month consumption was 332 units during December 2003 to December 2004 and it was 247 units during February, 2004 to December 2005. His total metered consumption from January 2006 till May 2007 comes to 2347 units which yields an average per month of 138 units. Thus, the applicant's consumption shows a sudden downfall of more than 50% during the period from January 2006 to May 2007 as compared to past period of 2 years. This tends to support the view that the quantum of 2700 units of consumption shown in June, 2007 must be the accumulation of large number of units upto the past period of about 17 months which were not accounted for properly and also that the meter reader might not have recorded readings correctly.

In the light of above, we hold that the applicant was billed as per his metered consumption and there is no need to revise the applicant's disputed bill in question.

In view of above, the applicant's grievance application stands rejected.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(S.J. Bhargawa)	(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)	(S.D. Jahagirdar)
Member-Secretary	MEMBER	CHAIRMAN

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD's
NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.**

**Member-Secretary
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co.Ltd.,
Nagpur Urban Zone, NAGPUR**