

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

Case No.05/2012

Date: 10/04/2012

**In the matter of
M/s. Poona Bearing Industries Pvt.Ltd.**

- Complainant

V/S

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

- Opponent

Quorum

Chair Person	Mr. S.D.Madake
Member/Secretary	Mr. L.G.Sagajkar
Member	Mr. Suryakant Pathak

- 1) M/s. Poona Bearing Industries Pvt.Ltd. Jyotiba nagar Talawade Tal. Haveli, Dist Pune has come before forum regarding excess P. F. penalty and unit charges from Aug-2008 to March-2009 pertaining to consumer No. 17137122772
- 2) Complainant approached to Internal Grievance Redressal Cell on 09/08/2011 regarding excess P.F. penalty and electricity charges. Not satisfied with the reply of IGRC dt/ 26/12/2011 complainant approached to Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum on 23/02/2012 and requested forum to correct electricity bills from Aug-2008 to March-2009
- 3) The respondent in their say submitted that consumer has charged P.F. penalty as per KWH and KVAH reading recorded on meter for the month

Aug-2008, Nov-2008, Jan-2009 and March-2009. Complainant sanctioned load was 65 HP and all parameter recorded by meter was correct.

- 4) We have heard the representative Shri.Gaurav Sharma of M/s. Poona Bearing Industries Pvt. Ltd. and MSEDCL representative Shri. Pethkar, Ex. Engr. Bhosari Division. Shri. Gaurav Sharma stated that the company has made lot of correspondence with MSEDCL regarding faulty energy meter. With constant follow up with MSEDCL the meter was replaced on 13/03/2009 by new meter. The excess P.F. Penalty and units were charged from August-2008 to March-2009. Also test report of meter was not received from Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co.Ltd. the testing charges was not paid as MSEDCL has not demanded at that time.
- 5) Shri. Pethkar, Ex.Engr. Bhosari contended that there was no record regarding meter replacement and stated that the meter was not tested at that time, also the reason for replacement of meter is not known as record is not available.
- 6) On rival contention following point arise for consideration.

- 1) Is complainant entitled for revision of bills from April-2008 to March-2009.

The point is answered as follows for reasons given below.

- 7) The meter was replaced by respondent after inspection at site. The meter was not tested nor testing fees was demanded .On verification of

documents and arguments advanced it is noticed that meter was faulty. As per MERC ESC Reg.2005 Sec. 15.4.1 the average consumption is to be calculated for 12 months average preceding the three months prior to the month in which the billing is contemplated. In this case the average is taken from May-2007 to April-2008 which comes to 3578 KWH . The P.F. Penalty to be calculated considering average of 3578 units from Aug-2008 to March-2009. As meter was faulty the difference of reading given by IGRC is quashed. Hence following order.

ORDER

- 1) The IGRC order for charging 3576 units is quashed.
- 2) The respondent is directed to revise the bill from Aug-2008 to March-2009 considering average of 3578 units per month also P.F. penalty should be calculated considering the same average.
- 3) Opponent to report compliance within one month from the date of this order.

Mr.L.G.Sagajkar
Member/Secretary

Mr.Suryakant Pathak
Member

Mr.S.D.Madake
Chair person

Date: 10/04/2012