

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/171/2006**

Applicant : Shri Vithoba Shyamrao Barve  
Ward No. 1,  
Near Bus-stop Parashivani  
Tq. Parashivani, Dist.  
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : MSEDCL represented by  
the Nodal Officer-  
Executive Engineer,  
O&M Division-II, NUZ,  
Nagpur.

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 30.12.2006)**

The present grievance application has been filed on 01.12.2006 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 installation of faulty meter at his premises and in respect of excessive billing done to him. He has also complained about illegal recovery of meter rent from him.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed his complaint on the same subject-matter of the present grievance to the Assistant Engineer Parashivani, MSEDCL, Nagpur with a copy to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (in short the cell) at Nagpur Rural Circle, MSEDCL, Nagpur. No remedy, whatsoever, was provided to the applicant's grievance by the Cell and hence the present grievance application.

The contention of the applicant is that the meter, being meter no. 1556002, installed at his premises on 23.07.2005 was faulty and that it had recorded erroneous and excessive consumption. He added that he ought to have been charged only for 30 units per month since he is using only 2 tube lights and 1 fan in his house. He further contended that the Cell had replied in writing to him that he will be charged @ 30 units per month. He has enclosed copies of his energy bills dated 08.09.2006 for the period from 31.06.2006 to 31.08.2006 meant for 105 units and contended that consumption of 105 units shown in this bill was erroneous and excessive. This bill is showing the applicant's consumption of 67 units against the applicant's meter, being

meter no. 1556002, and of 38 units against second meter, being meter no. 90046898 which was installed on 04.08.2006 replacing the applicant's previous meter, being meter no. 1556002. He has also made a complaint that lower level official of the non-applicant company had demanded illegal gratification of Rs.1000/- towards setting right his grievance. He had also made a mention about erroneous recovery of meter rent in his energy bills. His request is that he should be charged @ 30 units per month throughout. He has enclosed copies of his application addressed to the Assistant Engineer, Parashivani on 26.09.2006, another application dated 29.11.2006 addressed to the Jr. Engineer on the subject of supplying him his meter testing report and also copies of his energy bills dated 13.11.2006, 12.10.2006, 08.09.2006, 08.08.2006, 10.06.2006 and 13.06.2006.

The non-applicant has stated in his parawise report that there is no question of recovery of meter rent from the applicant since the MERC has already stopped recovery of meter rent from consumers w.e.f. May, 2000. He further contended that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 1556002, was replaced on 04.08.2006 by a new meter, being new meter no. 1556002. This meter was also sent to the meter testing unit at Khaparkheda because of the applicant's complaint dated 26.09.2006. The applicant's meter was found to be running slow by 15%. A copy of the meter testing report is also produced on record by him.

He added that no proof is produced on record by the applicant to the effect that the Cell has given any order for billing the applicant @ 30 units per month. The applicant's meter, being meter no. 1556002, was installed on 23.07.2005 at initial reading of 00002 and

that this meter showed final reading of 00549 on 04.08.2006 when it was removed from the applicant's place and sent to the testing unit. The applicant's consumption was of 547 units during the period from 23.07.2005 to 04.08.2006 i.e. for a period of about 12 months against this meter. According to the non-applicant, the per month average consumption yielded by this meter comes to 45.58 units. The non-applicant further contended that the applicant's second meter, being meter no. 46898, installed on 04.08.2006 replacing the applicant's previous meter, being meter no. 1556002, has shown consumption by the applicant of 194 units during the period from 04.08.2006 till 14.12.2006. This also yields an average per month of 43.11 units. According to him, the per month average consumption as yielded by these two meters is almost the same.

The non-applicant lastly contended that the billing done to the applicant was proper throughout and that there is no substance in the applicant's grievance.

In this case, what is seen from the record is that the applicant was rightly charged as per metered readings as shown by the applicant's meter, being meter nos. 1556002 and 46898 from time to time. The applicant's contention that he should be charged @ 30 units per month cannot be accepted by us for the simple reason that billing done to the applicant was as per metered readings as would be clear from the entries of applicant's CPL in respect of the above two meters. It is pertinent to mention here that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 1556002, showed consumption of 40 units during the month of June, 2006 vide applicant's energy bill dated 10.07.2006. The applicant's energy bill dated 08.09.2006 shows consumption of 105

units. This consumption pertains to two meters. The applicant's previous meter, being meter no. 1556002, has shown consumption of 67 units while the applicant's new meter, being meter no. 46898 has recorded consumption of 38 units. The applicant has taken objection to this bill stating that his consumption was excessive. The applicant's grievance in this respect cannot be accepted for the simple reason that he was billed against the aforementioned two meters strictly as per metered readings. The applicant has also not been able to produce on record any other cogent and convincing proof to substantiate his contentions. There is also no proof submitted by him to show that the Cell has issued an order mentioning that he should be charged @ 30 units per month.

The non-applicant has produced on record a copy of the testing report of the applicant's meter, being meter no. 1556002. This report clearly shows that the meter was found to be running slow by 15%. The non-applicant has rightly stated in his parawise report that the applicant's per month consumption is about 45 units per month. When asked by us, the applicant stated that he has no complaint in respect of reading recorded by his new meter, being meter no. 46898. This meter shows consumption 194 units during the period from 04.08.2006 till 14.12.2006. Thus, the applicant's per month average consumption as shown by this meter comes to 43 units. The applicant's previous meter, being meter no. 1556002, has shown consumption of 547 units during the period from 23.07.2005 to 04.08.2006. This yields per month consumption of 45.58 units. Thus, it is proved beyond doubt that the per month average consumption of the applicant was almost the same against the applicant's previous meter i.e. meter no. 1556002

and applicant's subsequent meter, being meter no. 46898. The other grievance of the applicant is about illegal recovery of meter rent. The non-applicant has clarified that no meter rent has been recovered from the applicant from May,2000. The applicant has perhaps construed the fixed charge as meter rent. The applicant's grievance in this respect is, therefore, misconceived and hence the same is not sustainable

In totality, we find no substance in the applicant's grievance.

The applicant's grievance application, therefore, stands rejected.

<b>Sd/-</b> <b>(S.J. Bhargawa)</b> Member-Secretary	<b>Sd/-</b> <b>(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)</b> MEMBER	<b>Sd/-</b> <b>(S.D. Jahagirdar)</b> CHAIRMAN
---	---	---

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

**Member-Secretary  
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,  
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co.Ltd.,  
Nagpur Urban Zone, NAGPUR.**