



**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
M.S.E.D.C.L., PUNE ZONE, PUNE**

Case No.13/2014

Date of Grievance : 30.06.2014

Date of Order : 18.03.2015

In the matter of exorbitant billing.

Mr.Khubo Mohandas Mangatani.
S.No.11/2/9,Opp.Sukhwani
Paradise, Pimpri,
Pune-411002.

Complainant

(Herein after referred to as Consumer)

Versus

Executive Engineer,
M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Pimpri Division,
Pune.

Respondent

(Herein after referred to as Licensee)

Quorum

Chair person
Member Secretary
Member

Mr. S.N.Shelke
Mr. Y. M.Kamble
Mr.Suryakant Pathak

Appearance

For Consumer

Mr.Khubo Mohandas Mangatani

**Mr. D.R.Aundhekar , Ex.Engineer,
Pimpri Dn.**
Mr.Ravindra S.Khadadkar
Addl.Ex.Engr.Kharalwadi S/Dn.
Mr.Shreekrishana Suresh Bhang
Dy.Manager (Finance)

- 1) The Consumer has filed present Grievance application under regulation no. 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & E.O.) Regulations 2006.

- 2) Being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the order dated 30.04.2014 passed by IGRC Ganeshkhind Urban Circle, Pune, the consumer above named files the present grievance application on the following amongst other grounds.
- 3) The papers containing the above grievance were sent by the Forum to the Executive Engineer, M.S.E.D.C.L., Pimpri Division, Pune vide letter no. EE/CGRF/PZ/Notice/13 of 2014/126 dtd.07.07.2014. Accordingly the Distribution Licensee i.e. MSEDCL has filed its reply on 21.07 .2014.
- 4) In spite of several chances being given to the consumer for final hearing, consumer namely Khubo Mohandas Mangatani, remained absent, therefore final hearing was conducted in his absence.
- 5) We heard Mr.Ravindra Khadadkar, Addl.Ex.Engineer, Mr.Shreekrishana Suresh Bhangе, Dy.Manager, Finance on behalf of licensee and perused the documents produced on record.
- 6) As per the case of consumer & reply filed by licensee & on perusal of documents, following factual aspects were disclosed.
 - i) Energy connection bearing consumer no.170144295164 is standing in the name of Khubo Mohandas Mangtani.
 - ii) The date of said connection is 18.02.2009.
 - iii) Average bills were issued to the consumer from March-2011 to Sept.-2013.
 - iv) Old meter of said connection vide meter no.00115513 was changed having final reading 5884 & in that place new meter vide no.16597701 was installed having meter reading 0007 in the month of Feb.2011.
 - v) The Assistant Engineer of the Licensee visited the spot in the month of Sept.2013 & noticed the reading of new meter was 42372 KWH. Thereafter B-46 was fed in Oct.2013 as 42322 & billing was made as per reading.
 - vi) IGRC rejected the grievance of the consumer vide impugned order dated 30.4.2014.
- 7) According to the consumer, the licensee issued average bills though meter reading was available therefore assessment for a period exceeding three months cannot be done & excess amount recovered from him be refunded with interest at the rate 12% p.a. & revised bill be prepared only for 3 months of average consumption.

- 8) According to Licensee meter of the said consumer was changed in the month of Feb.2011 & thereafter from Aug.2011 to Sept.2013 average bills were issued. Thereafter in the month of Sept.2013 the Asstt. Engineer, GKUC, made spot inspection and noticed reading of new meter 42372 KWH. Therefore manual debit B-80 for units from 1879 to 42322 of Rs.3,85,224.05 was fed to the system & later by feeding online debit B-80 amount comes to Rs.3,58,590/-. Therefore difference of Rs.26,663.80 was credited in consumers account in March-2014. Similarly the system has given lock credit in Oct.2013 of Rs.41,017.12. It is submitted on behalf of licensee that the said consumer has paid entire bill of Rs.4,08,480/- on 30.01.2014. The licensee has made billing as per reading according to law & therefore question does not arise for any refund of bill amount or interest thereon.
- 9) On perusal of documents it is seen that the licensee continued to issue bills to the consumer on average basis for more than 2 years. The licensee has not set up a case of inaccessible meter. Moreover, it is not their case that after two consecutive efforts to effect a meter reading, meter was inaccessible, nor, they served any notice to the consumer as contemplated under Section 163 of Electricity Act. Similarly, it is not the case of consumer that the said meter was defective or stopped recording reading. However the licensee continued to issue average bills to the consumers from July-2011 to Sept.2013. This fact establishes that lethargy is on the part of licensee. Therefore licensee shall take suitable action against the defaulting employee for issuance of average bills for more than 2 years. At the same time, the consumer has paid the amount of bill. He did not remain present at the time of final hearing though sufficient chances were granted. Last bill was issued to the consumer by the Licensee as per rules and it was paid by him. Therefore we do not find any substance in the grievance of the consumer hence grievance is liable to be dismissed.
- 10) Post of Chairperson, CGRF of this Zone was vacant during the period from 28.7.2014 to 7.12.2014. Hence grievance could not be decided during a period of 2 months.

11) We proceed to pass following order :

ORDER

1. Grievance of the consumer stands dismissed with no order as to cost.
2. Licensee to take suitable action against the defaulting employee for issuance of average bills to the consumer though meter was accessible.
3. Licensee to report compliance within one month of receipt of this order.

Delivered on: - 18/03/2015

Y.M.Kamble
Member/Secretary
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

S.N.Shelke
Chairperson
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Suryakant Pathak
Member
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Note :- The consumer if not satisfied may filed representation against this his order at the following address.

Office of the Ombudsman,
Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,
606/608, Keshav Bldg.,
Bandra Kurla Complex,
Bandra(E), Mumbai-51.
