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

Case No. CGRF(NZ)/44/2017

Applicant : Shri Rameshwar S.Bawankar

114/115, Gujri Bazar, Telipura

Kamptee-12.

Non-applicant: Nodal Officer,

The Executive Engineer, O&M Division, MSEDCL,

Mouda.

Appellant:- In person

Respondent by 1) EE, O&M Division, MSEDCL, Mouda

2) Dy.E.E., Kamptee S/Dn.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,

Chairman.

2) Shri N.V.Bansod Member

3) Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member, Secretary

ORDER PASSED ON 21.04.2017.

- 1. The Applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 23.03.2017 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as said Regulations).
- 2. Applicant's case in brief is that since October-2016 he received excessive bills. In October-2016 he received bill of Rs.392311.12 for recording his commercial

Page no.1 of 5 case no.44/2017

connection at Readymade Shop Kamptee. Bill may be revise.

3. Non-applicant denied the applicant's case by filling reply dated 12.04.2017. It is submitted that applicant had commercial connection vide cons.No.410030239567 (P.C.-0). There is also another connection of the applicant in the same premises for the residential purpose vide Cons. No.410030241723 (P.C.-2). Both the meters are fixed adjacent to each other. On 19-10-2016 Assistant Engineer of MSEDCL inspected this spot and found that for cons. No. 410030239567 there is meter No. 49987823 and meter reading was 52065. This meter is used for Readymade Shop. At the time of verification of electricity bill, it is noticed that on electricity bills of this connection meter No.60044985 is wrongly written. Due to this over side mistake, it is wrongly shown that in May-2015 this meter is replaced. Therefore meter No. of both connections of the applicant are similar and no meter was replaced. But since May-2015 due to over side and mistake both these consumer Numbers meter number is same. Both these meters are maintained on different P.C. Therefore consumption of residential connection Cons. No.410030241723 (residential connection) is noted in commercial connection of the applicant vide Cons.No.4100239567 since May-2015. In fact commercial meter vide cons.No.410030239567 is never replaced. User of the connection Shri Chandrashekhar K.Wanjari i.e. the applicant was utilizing about 2000 units p.m. for his commercial connection and he is paying electricity bills since June-2015 every month for about 2000 units. In May-2015 there was over side mistake about replacement of the meter in I.T. Section and it was incorrect feeding in the computer. Therefore since June-2015 to August-2016 incorrect bills of incorrect reading was issued for about only 500 units p.m. instead of 2000 unit p.m. In September-2016, this mistake was rectified about meter No. and since then meter is showing consumption of 2000 unit p.m. as

Page no.2 of 5 case no.44/2017

usual. In October-2016 accumulated consumption in commercial meter of the consumer 25065 was recorded as per spot inspection report and bill for 39592 units for Rs.392311/- was issued. It is consumption utilized by the applicant and accumulated in the meter therefore billing is proper. Bill cannot be revise.

- 4. Forum heard arguments of both the side and perused record.
- 5. MSEDCL produced spot inspection report dated 19-10-2016. At the bottom of this report, it is specifically written that consumer is billed for another meter in the same name having Cons.No.410030241723. The said consumer meter was never replaced by meter No.6004485 but wrong feeding to IT section due to same consumer name. Hence consumer paid less billing from May-2015 to Sept-2016 present meter pertaining to said consumer is showing the consumption. It is noteworthy that this spot inspection report is duly signed by applicant in English. Alongwith this spot inspection report there is संयुक्त तपासणी अहवाल (joint inspection report) dated 19-10-2016 it is also duly signed by officers of MSEDCL and applicant in English.
- 6. MSEDCL has produced another CPL of the applicant. It shows that for commercial connection Cons.No.410030239567 for Readymade Store applicant had consumption of more than 2000 unit p.m. uptill January-2015. During the period Jun-2015 to August-2016 consumption is shown less than 500 units p.m. and the reading was wrong due to incorrect feeding in IT section about to replacement of meter. But in fact no meter was replaced. This over side mistake was then and realize in spot inspection and it was rectified. It is noteworthy that before mistake there was consumption of 2000 unit p.m. of the applicant regarding commercial meter. It means during the period June-2015 to August-2016 consumption was about 2000 unit p.m. but it was wrongly shown 500 unit p.m due to wrong feeding in IT section but the

Page no.3 of 5 case no.44/2017

consumption in accumulated in meter. Meter is O.K. therefore accumulated consumption is utilized by applicant and hence MSEDCL has issued bill of 39592 units for Rs.392311/- in the month of October-2016. It is the bill of consumption accumulated by the meter and utilized by the applicant.

- 7. MSEDCL had produced bill revision chart on record in this chart consumption is shown 39592 unit and per month consumption is shown 2475 unit p.m. Therefore there is same trend of consumption. Therefore in our opinion bill issued by MSEDCL to the applicant is correct and cannot be revise.
- 8. However record shows that there was mistake while feeding in IT section and due to this mistake entire episode happened. It appears that any employee working in I.T. Section played this mischief. It is also possible that applicant may be behind the carton. Possibility can not be rulled out that applicant and employee working in I.T. Section might have join the hands of each other therefore only this designly defective method is adopted to reduce consumption of 2000 unit p.m. upto 500 unit p.m. for Readymade shop of applicant therefore ultimately applicant was benefited due to this mischief. Therefore it is necessary to have department enquiry of this aspect by appropriate Authority.
- 9. It is desirous that Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Mouda Division shall conduct departmental enquiry into the matter and to fix the responsibility who had committed mistake in feeding to IT section and to take action in accordance with Rules and Regulations.
- 10. It is true that MSEDCL issued bill of accumulated consumption for 39592 units for Rs.392311/- MSEDCL is at liberty to grant suitable installment for payment to the

Page no.4 of 5 case no.44/2017

applicant.

- 11. Grievance application deserves to be dismiss with certain directions.
- 12. Hence we proceed to pass the following order.

ORDER

- 1. Grievance application is dismissed.
- 2. MSEDCL is at liberty to grant suitable installment to the applicant.
- 3. Executive Engineer, MSEDCL Mouda Division is directed to take departmental enquiry into the matter as to why there was wrong feeding in IT section and shall fix responsibility and shall to take action against the concerned person in accordance with Rules and Regulations.
- 4. Non-applicant is directed to comply within 30 days from the date of this order.

Sd/- sd/- sd/
(N.V.Bansod) (Mrs.V.N.Parihar) (Shivajirao S. Patil),

MEMBER MEMBER/SECRETARY CHAIRMAN

page no.5 of 5 case no.32/2017