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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/0143/2006

Applicant	: Shri Kacharu Sukaji Wasnik, Plot No. 324, Siddarthnagar, Teka, Nagpur.
Non-Applicant	: The Nodal Officer- Executive Engineer, Civil Line Division, NUZ, Nagpur representing the MSEDCL.
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 25.08.2006)

The present grievance application has been filed on 03.08.2006 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 grievance of the applicant is in respect of erroneous energy bill amounts against his meter, being meter no. 82456, for the period from May 2005 to November, 2005. Before filing of the present grievance application, the applicant had made a complaint addressed to the Jr. Engineer, Kamptee Road, MSEDCL, Nagpur on 24.11.2005 and also to the Chief Engineer on 16.05.2006. He had also endorsed a copy of his complaint application dated 24.11.2005 to the Chief Engineer, MSEDCL, NUZ, Nagpur. He had made this complaint on the same subject-matter of the present grievance. This complaint was not forwarded by these officers to the Internal Grievance Redressal Unit nor any satisfactory remedy was provided to the applicant's grievance. Hence, he has filed the present grievance application before this Forum under the said Regulations.

The matter was heard by us on 25.08.2006.

A copy of the non-applicant's parawise report dated 17.08.2006 was duly received by the applicant before the date of hearing.

It is the contention of the applicant that his energy bills against his meter, being meter no. 82456 for the period from May 2005 to November 2005, were not only excessive but they were also unjust and improper. He also submitted that his meter, being meter no. 82456, was defective during this period and hence excess consumption came to be shown in his bills. He had applied to the Jr. Engineer concerned for correction of these bills on 24.11.2005 followed by another application, being application dated 15.05.2006. However, his energy bills in question were not revised.

He added that credit given to him of Rs. 1050/- by the nonapplicant is not adequate.

He lastly submitted that his energy bills in question may be corrected and additional appropriate credit given to him.

The non-applicant has submitted in his parawise report as well as in his oral submissions that the applicant's energy bills for the period from May, 2005 to November, 2005 i.e. for eight months were corrected and he was charged for 1489 units during this period in place of 1985 units already charged to him earlier. Thus, he was given a credit of Rs. 1050/-. According to him, after revision of the applicant's energy bills in question, an amount of Rs. 7770/- is outstanding against him as at present which the applicant has not so far paid and that his faulty meter, being meter no. 82456, was changed on 24.11.2005 by replacing it by a new meter, being meter no. 784954. The applicant has been served with his energy bills as per metered readings from March,2006. He added that adequate credit is already given to the applicant in response to his complaint.

It is pertinent to note in the present case that the nonapplicant has categorically admitted in his parawise report dated 17.08.2006 that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 82456, which was in operation at the applicant's premises from May, 2005 to November, 2005 was faulty. Hence, the legal provision contained in Regulation 15.4.1 of the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Other Conditions of Supply) Regulations, 2005 would be squarely applicable to the present case since billing has been done in the event of a defective meter.

The text of the relevant portion of Regulation 15.4.1 reads as under.

The non-applicant has admitted that the applicant's meter was faulty. There was also no test of the meter taken by the nonapplicant which, in fact, ought to have been taken by him. In any case, since the applicant's meter in question was faulty, the applicant ought to have been charged only for a maximum period of three months as against which he has been charged for eight months for consumption for 1489 units. The per month consumption of the applicant comes to 1489 / 8 = 186 units. Hence, it follows that the applicant deserves to be charged for 186 x 3 = 558 units only. The non-applicant has stated in his parawise report that there were 50 units consumed by the applicant from his previous meter, being meter no. 76738, which need to be added to this consumption. Hence, it now follows that the applicant should have been charged for 558 + 50 = 608 units as against 1489 units.

In the result, we direct the non-applicant to revise the applicant's energy bill and give additional credit for 1489-608 = 881 units in addition to the credit already given to him.

The applicant's grievance application thus stands disposed off accordingly.

The non-applicant shall report compliance of this Order to this Forum on or before 25.09.2006.

Sd/-Sd/-Sd/-(S.J. Bhargawa)(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)(S.D. Jahagirdar)Member-SecretaryMEMBERCHAIRMAN

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