

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/78/2014**

Applicant : Shri Subhash W. Dhote,  
137, Dattatrayanagar,  
Chaitra Apartments,  
Nagpur.

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 25.4.2014.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 21.3.2014 under Regulation 6.5 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. Along with main application the applicant also filed the application for Interim Relief under section 8.3 of the said regulations and claimed to reconnect his electricity supply.

3. After hearing both the parties, this Forum had issued Interim Order dated 25.3.2014, in which the applicant was directed to deposit Rs. 7000/- against the total bill immediately. On depositing the above amount, non applicant was directed to reconnect the supply. Non applicant was further directed to replace the meter of the applicant and submit the meter testing report of laboratory of M.S.E.D.C.L. Non applicant was also directed to inspect the installation of the applicant in respect of advancing the meter even after disconnection, and submit spot inspection report before this Forum. Accordingly, non applicant submitted meter testing report on Dt. 21.4.2014.

4. Applicant's case in brief is that he is a residential consumer of the non applicant bearing Consumer No. 410014935561. Non applicant issued energy bill in the month of September 2013 for Rs. 48450.00 for 9251 units. This bill is abnormally excessive compared with previous consumption of average 165 units per month. Even then, he paid Rs. 7000/- as first installment on 29.10.2013 and was ready to pay the remaining amount in suitable installments. But non applicant disconnected his supply without considering his request. Therefore applicant claimed to reconnect his electricity supply.

5. Non applicant denied the applicant's case by filing detail reply Dt. 25.3.2014. It is submitted that meter status was shown 'Locked' in the month of January 2012 and average bill for 100 units was issued. In February 2012 meter reading was shown 3 units bill for '0' units consumption for Rs. -5637.09 was issued by deducting previous average amount paid for 17

months for Rs. 5670.76. From April 2013 to September 2013, bill for average of 100 units per month was issued. From November 2012 to January 2013, meter status was shown as 'Faulty' and average bill for 94 units was given. For February 2013 bill for actual reading for 413 units and in August 2013 bill for actual reading for 9251 units was issued. Consumer complained that excessive bill has been issued for August 2013. Because proper reading was not taken since beginning, the consumption from September 2010 to August 2013 i.e. 10243 units has been divided throughout the period and amount of Rs. 54450.15 has been deducted from the bill for the month of September 2013. The consumer has made last payment on Dt. 29.10.2013 for Rs. 7000/-. The consumer was in arrears of Rs. 46814.00. As such he was served upon a notice of disconnection under section 56(1) of E.A. 2003. On expiry of notice period, the supply of the applicant was disconnected on 14.3.2014. The consumer may be directed to pay the bill for Rs. 48324.86 for the month of February 2014.

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

7. As per the meter testing report submitted by the non applicant, the meter was found O.K. in laboratory testing. As such there is no scope for any revision of the bill of applicant. However, Non applicant is responsible for not taking the meter reading for as many as 36 months and as such allowed the consumption to be accumulated. Hence the applicant deserves compensation as per MERC (Standard of performance of

Distribution Licensee, Period of Giving Supply and Determination of Compensation) Regulations, 2005. The applicant further deserves slab benefit for accumulated consumption for 36 months.

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

### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) Non applicant is directed to withdraw the energy bill of the consumer for the month of August 2013.
- 3) Non applicant is further directed to divide the consumption of August 2013 i.e. 9251 units in 36 months and revise the bill by giving suitable slab benefit.
- 4) Non applicant is also directed to deduct the amount paid by the applicant through out the above period.
- 5) Non applicant is directed to pay the compensation for not taking meter reading as per 7 (i) of Annexure 'A' appended to MERC (Standard of performance of Distribution Licensee, Period of Giving Supply and Determination of Compensation) Regulations, 2005.

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

Sd/-  
( Adv. Subhash Jichkar)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Vishnu S. Bute),  
CHAIRMAN