

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/61/2014**

Applicant : Shri Tolaram Kesumal Wadhvani,  
Thr:- Shri Mahesh Anandani,  
Sindhu Coop. Hsg. Society, Jaripatka,  
Nagpur: 14.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,  
The Superintending Engineer,  
(Distribution Franchisee),  
MSEDCL,  
NAGPUR.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Vishnu S. Bute,  
Chairman.  
2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar  
Member.  
3) Shri B.A. Wasnik,  
Member Secretary.

**ORDER PASSED ON 19.3.2014.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 25.2.2014 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 applicants' case in brief is that applicant is a residential consumer of non applicant, bearing Consumer No. 410010984711. He has received excessive bills. His meter was running 3 times faster. When he complained to non applicant, non applicant replaced his meter for testing. The test report was O.K. He

approached to I.G.R.C. I.G.R.C. disposed his application by order dated 28.11.2013. But he is not satisfied with the said order. Hence applicant filed present grievance application for revision of bills.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 7.3.2014. It is submitted that the connection is released in the name of Shri Tolaram Kesumal Wadhwani and complainant Shri Mahesh Anandani is not the consumer as per section 2 (15) of I.E. Act 2003. Hence Grievance application may be dismissed.

4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.

5. It is an admitted fact that the that the connection is released in the name of Shri Tolaram Kesumal Wadhwani and complainant Shri Mahesh Anandani is not the consumer within the meaning of Section 2 (15) of Indian Electricity Act 2003. Moreover, this Forum has observed that the said complainant Shri Mahesh Anandani is even not duly authorized by the consumer to represent on his behalf. Hence this Forum is of the opinion that the complainant Shri Mahesh Anandani can not be allowed to represent on behalf of the original consumer Shri Tolaram Kesumal Wadhwani.

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

#### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-  
(B.A. Wasnik)  
MEMBER  
SECRETARY

Sd/-  
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Vishnu S. Bute),  
CHAIRMAN