

**Before Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Limited
Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Pune Zone,
925, Kasabapeth Building, I Ind flr. Pune-11**

Case No. 26/2012

Date: 19/10/2012

**In the matter of
Shri.Digambar Vaman Gorde
Chikhali, Mhetre Vasti, Bhosari**

- Complainant

V/S

M.S.E.D.C.L. Bhosari Division

- Opponent

Quorum

Chair Person	Shri.S.D.Madake
Member/Secretary,	Shri.B.M.Ivare
Member	Shri.Suryakant Pathak

- 1) Shri. Digambar Vaman Gorde is consumer of Maharashtra State Electricity Co. Ltd.(MSEDCL) having two residential connection vide bearing Con. No. 170101402331 and 170101402323 at Gat No. 1460 Mhetre Vasti Chikhali w.e.f. 13/08/2005 under O&M S/Dn. Akurdi of Bhosari Division.
- 2) The main grievance of the consumer is that at the time of electricity connection in 2005 MSEDCL (then MSEB) has charged the amount as referred in quotation more than the requisite charges as per rules . He paid Rs. 10,150/- for each connection referred above on 12/08/2005 vide receipt No. 9498415 and 9498414 in pursuance of the quotation dt. 8.8.2005 . Consumer prayed that the excess amount taken by MSEDCL as referred in the quotations referred above be returned to him and to take action against erring staff of MSEDCL.

- 3) According to MSEDCL the quotation are issued as per rules and particularly as per the departmental circular No. 486 (Commercial) dt. 08/08/1991 and general circulars(Commercial) No. 138 dt. 13/12/91 . According to MSEDCL Junior Engineer, moshi section, inspected the premises and issued correct quotation regarding the six rooms having six KW connected load for each electricity connection. The MSEDCL charged SLC Rs. 6000/- as per circular No. 486 at Index-III and Rs. 3000/- towards security deposit. It is alleged that, consumer is unnecessarily raising this issue after long time.
- 4) The consumer moved before IGRC on 02/7/2012 challenging that quotation was not proper and excess amount was collected by MSEDCL in 2005. The said complaint came to be rejected on 30/08/2012 observing that firm quotation charges including S.L.C. are correctly charged as per rules.
- 5) We heard complainant in person and Dy.Ex.Engr. Akurdi sub division representative of respondent .Perused all the documents on record. On careful perusal of dept. circular No. (Com) 486 dt. 08/08/1991, it is clear that MSEDCL is entitled to recover S.L.C. from consumer. As per table –III referred in the circular, the MSEDCL can charge S.L.C. for domestic consumer having more than five rooms, within the limits of municipal corporation, at the rate of Rs. 5000/- in addition to Rs.1000/- per KW or part thereof for load above 5 KW. Therefore the amount charged is correct as per this schedule of charges, on perusal of firm quotation dt.8/08/2005 MSEDCL claim Rs.150/- for service connection, Rs.1000/- towards meter cost and Rs.3000/- towards security deposit. Complainant failed to prove that MSEDCL charged more amounts from him.

- 6) Admittedly the complainant made a grievance in respect of the cause of action, which arose in August-2005. As per MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulation 2006 Clause No. 6.6 states that

“The forum shall not admit any grievance unless it is filed within two years from the date on which the cause of action has arisen” thus the complaint is barred by time limitation.

- 7) In the result, considering that complaint is filed beyond the period of limitation, the MSEDCL has claimed proper charges and complainant is making serious allegations without valid reasons. We hold that complaint is filed without valid reasons.

ORDER

Complaint is dismissed with no order as to cost.

B.M.Ivare,
Member/Secretary

Suryakant Pathak
Member

S.D.Madake
Chair Person

Date: 19/10/2012