

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

Case No. 34/2012

Date: 16/01/2013

In the matter of  
Shri.Vishnudatta Bhuralal Jani,  
463/64 ,Shoba Market,  
Budhawarpeth,Pune-02

**- Complainant**

**V/S**

M.S.E.D.C.L. Rastapeth Dn.

- Opponent

**Quorum**

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

- 1) Mr.Vishnudatta Bhuralal Jani is consumer of MSEDCL vide No. 170017358360 having electricity commercial connection in a shop premises at 463/64, shobha market, Budhawar Peth Pune-411002.
- 2) According to complainant MSEDCL charged wrong bills & not corrected within proper time. He claimed compensation as he was subjected to harassment as he has to move from pillar to post for the same.
- 3) The applicant filed complaint before Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (IGRC) RPUC, MSEDCL, Pune on dt.24/08/2012 and IGRC has dismissed case stating that the electricity bill is corrected. The applicant has filed complaint before forum on dt.05/12/2012, being aggrieved due to IGRC decision.
- 4) The complainant contended that there were no any arrears of electricity bill prior to June -2012. The MSEDCL has issued the bill of June-2012 of an amount of Rs.490/- under the head of faulty meter, zero reading, display not shown etc. for average 47 units. The MSEDCL has refused to

correct bill, hence complaint was filed to IGRC on dt.04/07/2012. He stated that it is the duty of MSEDCL to replace the faulty meter. He visited MSEDCL office on 04/07/2012 and MSEDCL has replaced the meter. The bill of June-2012 is corrected for 21 unit of an amount of Rs.325/-. Which amount was paid by him.

- 5) The complainant stated that MSEDCL has further issued the bill of July-2012 of an amount of Rs.720/- for only 13 units consumption with adding additional 35 units of previous month and bill of August-2012 of an amount of Rs.1030/- for only 17 units, even though all arrears prior to July-12 are Nil. MSEDCL is not responding for correction of bill even after constant follow up. He contented that the bill of Rs. 1170/- (Eleven hundred and seventy only) in respect of electricity charges for the month of Sept-2012 was paid on 01/10/2012 due to threat of disconnection by opponent.
- 6) The complainant further contended that MSEDCL has illegally disconnected his supply on 09/10/2012 even when all amounts of electricity charges were paid on 01/10/2012. Hence prayer is to give compensation towards harassment and traveling cost etc. i.e. for deficiency in service.
- 7) As per MSEDCL, the bill of June-2012 was given under faulty status. When consumer visited to sub division office on 10/07/2012, the bill was immediately corrected as per meter reading 103 as informed by applicant and bill of Rs.325 /- was given to consumer for payment and accordingly bill was paid on 10/07/2012. Complainant therefore did not have any grievance in respect of bill .
- 8) On 04/07/2012, the consumer meter Sr. No. 1733601 was replaced by new radio frequency meter (RF) bearing Sr. No. 20512043 during R.F. meter installation drive in that area.
- 9) After replacement of old meter having VAM make, bearing Sr. No. 1733601, it is observed that final reading of meter was 117. Hence the bill of July 12 was given as new meter consumed units 13 with adding old meter balance consumed unit 35. Hence the total bill issued for 48

units. Finally on 20/09/2012 the bill of June & July-2012 is corrected and credit of Rs.315.17 is given in the bill of Sept-2012 month to consumer. The total bill amount of Sept-2012 is Rs.1170/- including arrears of July & August-2012, which is correct and amount was already paid by applicant.

- 10)** We have heard both sides. Perused all documents submitted by MSEDCL and applicant. It is seen that complainant file complaint to IGRC, Pune on 04/07/2012 and then it was taken back on 16/07/12, since opponent issued correct bill. Then again he filed complaint dt.24/08/2012 to IGRC for the same cause.
- 11)** As per record shown by MSEDCL viz. meter replacement register, store register & utilization of old meter to new connection, the final reading of old meter bearing Sr. No. 1733601 of VAM make is 117 units.

Further as per revision of bill (B-80) dt.20/09/2012 for the month of June & July 2012 shows that the bill is corrected as per reading consumption of meter as below.

Particulars	Initial reading	Final reading	Total unit consumption
Old meter consumption	82	117	35
New meter consumption	01	14	13
Total units consumptions for two months	-	-	48

The bill revision shows that bill is prepared for only 48 units and amount Rs.315.73 is credited to consumer during Sept-2012 and total bill of Rs.1169.80 was issued to consumer, which was paid by him on 01/10/2012.

- 12)** Hence above record shows that bills are corrected as per actual consumption of meter. The reading of consumer meter is not taken in June-2012 month, however it is taken during next immediate month July-2012

As per MERC (standard of performance of Distribution licensees, period for giving supply and determination of compensation) Regulation -2005, Clause No. 9.1 reading of consumer's meter shall be undertaken at least once in every two month for all consumers except Agricultural Consumer.

Therefore applicant is not entitled for any compensation as per SOP of MERC regulation 2005, since reading of meter is taken during next month.

- 13)** As per complainant, his electricity supply was disconnected on 09/10/2012, even though all arrears were paid on 01/10/2012. MSEDCL vide letter dt.29/12/2012, has stated that no temporary disconnection as alleged by complainant was made by MSEDCL. The consumer is not giving any evidence regarding temp. disconnection of his connection. Hence record shows that there was no temporary disconnection by MSEDCL as alleged by complainant.
- 14)** Complainant claimed compensation, for deficiency in service. The record shows MSEDCL has issued the bill as per the consumption. Consumer has alleged that his electricity was temporarily disconnected without leading any evidence. Hence complaint is not based on sufficient grounds and is devoid of substance.

In the result, we pass the following order.

### **ORDER**

- 1) Complaint is dismissed
- 2) No order as to cost.

B.M.Ivare,  
Member/Secretary

Suryakant Pathak  
Member

S.D.Madake  
Chair Person

Date: 16/01/2013