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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/125/2014

Applicant	: Shri Gowardhan D. Fulkar, near Buddha Vihar, Imam Wada, Great Nag Road, Nagpur.
Non–applicant	: Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee), MSEDCL, NAGPUR.
<u>Quorum Present</u>	: 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman.
	2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar Member.
	3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,

ORDER PASSED ON 26.6.2014.

Member / Secretary.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 17.5.2014 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 applicant's case in brief is that he filed an application dated 7.5.2014 to non applicant alleging that he is receiving excessive bills but even then his bill was not revised. He filed grievance application before Learned I.G.R.C. However, Learned I.G.R.C. did Page 1 of 4 Case No. 125/14

not allow the grievance application and disposed off the same as per order dated 17.5.2014. Therefore the applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum and requested to revise the bill.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 7.6.2014. It is submitted that meter of the applicant was tested in meter testing laboratory in presence of the applicant on 17.5.2014 and it is found that meter is O.K. Therefore no relief can be granted to the applicant.

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

5. There is meter testing report on record dated 17.5.2014 and it shows that meter of the applicant is tested and it is found O.K. Therefore whatever the consumption is recorded by the meter is the consumption utilised by the applicant.

6. During the course of arguments, Forum made a query to the applicant that what is his job and applicant replied that he is a labour. On perusal of living standard of the applicant, Forum suspected and therefore again and again put up a question to the applicant whether really he is a labour, then only the applicant admitted that he is an Advocate, but again cleverly admitted that non practicing advocate. The applicant was wearing several golden rings in hand, entered into hall talking on mobile phone having a good living standard and he was arguing that he was a labour. When there

Case No. 125/14

was a query what are the equipments in his house, the applicant admitted in clear terms that there is one cooler, 2 fans, 1 T.V., 3 CFL & 1 freeze and there are four rooms to the house. However, M/s. SPANCO produced spot inspection report on record Dt. 28.5.2014 with following findings :-

i)	No. of rooms	-	5 Nos.
ii)	Fans	-	5 Nos.
iii)	Bulb	-	40 W – 1, '0' – 1.
iv)	CFL	-	15 W - 1, 8 W-2, 5W – 1.
v)	Tube lights	-	5 Nos.
vi)	T.V.	-	1 Nos.
vii)	Freeze	-	1 Nos.
viii)	Cooler	-	1 No.

Therefore, it is clear that the applicant suppressed the truth from the Forum and tried to show minimum equipments so also tried to show that he is a labour. If really a labour of India can afford such residential equipments, we are definitely proud of it that there is better progress of standard of labours in India. But any way, whosoever the consumer may be either an advocate or a labour, if he utilizing this much equipments, it is but natural to have consumption recorded by the accurate meter.

7. As we have already pointed that meter of the applicant is tested and it is found O.K. Therefore there is no scope for revision of bill. Learned I.G.R.C. had already passed legal and proper order, therefore needs no interference. In our considered opinion the application deserves to be dismissed.

8. Hence we proceed to pass following order : -

ORDER

1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-(Anil Shrivastava) MEMBER SECRETARY Sd/-(Adv. Subhash Jichkar) MEMBER Sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil), CHAIRMAN