

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM,  
AKOLA ZONE, AKOLA.**

*“ Vidyut Bhavan ” Ratanlal Plots, Akola : 444001 Tel No 0724 .2434476*

---

**Dt.06/02/2016**

**Complaint No. 34 / 2015**

**Grievance pertaining to SOP compensation on account of failure of transformer  
and loss of crops.**

**Quorum**

**Shri T.M.Mantri, Chairman  
Shri. R.A. Ramteke ,Member-Secretary  
Shri. D.M.Deshpande-Member (CPO)**

Sau. Savita Kundan Zade  
Consumer no. LT-IV- 359781169917

Complainant

.....Vrs.....

Executive Engineer MSEDCL, Achalpur, Division.

Respondent

**Appearances :**

Complainant Representative: In person.

Respondent Representative: Shri. A.V. Joshi Assistant Engineer

1. Complainants case in brief is that after the troubleshoot in transformer on dt. 05/08/2015 oral as well as written complaint were made but to no effect. In spite contacting Shri. Tayade, A.E. to concerned Junior Engineer but no steps have been taken. Again complaints were made not only by the complainant but by other agriculturists also for repairs to be carried out in D.P. It is alleged that on 01/11/2015 the D.P. was repaired through private Technician Dhumale and Bhambhurkar. It is also alleged that for want of technical person and necessary materials in Sub Division, irrigation could not be done to crop of Sugar Cane for 79 days, resulting in loss of Rs. 3,00,000/- Hence sought the reliefs prayed for. Alongwith complaint copies of documents filed.
2. The N.A. filed the reply after notice stating that the transformer was not completely failed but interruptions in supply occurred because of peak irrigation season. The concerned lineman attended and rejoined all the complaints of the complainants, time to time. It is alleged that Rs.65060/- is outstanding arrears as in

Sept-2015 and the complainant has not paid amount since Nov-2010. Reference has been made to the spot inspection carried out in presence of representative of the complainant on 19/11/2014 that time revealed that the complainant is utilizing 7.3 H.P load against 5 H.P sanction load. Reference has been made to issuing of revised bill under Krushi Sanjivani bill with letter dt 16/05/2015 so also reference has been made about requirement of material and estimate to the concerned office and after getting material the work was done of the said D.P. which is ok. No other consumer has made complainant. As per N.A. the complainant is not interested in even after correction of the bills of and want to take advantages of Krushi Sanjivani scheme. No case for compensation is made out hence complaint needs to be dismissed. Copies of documents annexed with the reply. Later on both the parties filed document also.

3. The complainant filed notes of arguments. Heard Shri. A.V.Joshi the learned representative of the N.A. As per the complainants claim she has claimed compensation of Rs.94,800/- for 79 days so also in the complaint alleged loss of crop worth Rs.300,000/- Even in the notes of arguments such claim in made. So according to the complainant's claim the transformer was failed for 79 days as per the claim made. However the available material on record does not support the said case i.e. total failure of the transformer is not established. The record reveals that in fact there used to be low voltage. As per N.A. as well as other available document on records. The complainants as well as other have made grievance about not receiving of continuous supply of the required voltage. In some of the letters filed on record it is clear that the wireman used to make repairs, however after some time there used to be problem of low voltage. As per report of the Dy. E/E during relevant period there was low input voltage on the said feeder, The Xerox copy of some of the pages is filed on record, which also depicts the said position. Similarly that there written statement of some of the concerned agriculturist referred that there was no total failure of Devare D.P but during Sept/Oct-2015 there was no supply of required voltage and the Tambe wireman used to make repairs for regular voltage supply. So from the record it is clear that it is non-

maintenance of the voltage supply within specified range of the declared voltage. The available material on record shows that the problem was of intermittent supply of low voltage. The complainant could not succeed in establishing total failure of the transformer/D.P for the alleged period. As observed above the problem was of non maintenance of supply of declared voltage. As per MERC regulation-2014 in Appendix-A under clause 3 (i) the prescribed standards of performance on the part of licensee is provided for the said activity/ event. However in the column of compensation payable it is clear that only for Mumbai city, Metro cities and corporations, provision for compensation it is mentioned that “provided further that the Commission shall separately notify the date on which such compensation shall be payable in other areas, not covered above, in the state”. On query being made it has been informed that MERC has not issued any such notification, As per regulation 2014 (and even earlier regulation of 2005) such is the position. Consequently compensation for the said event/ activity cannot be granted.

4. As clear from the record there is also controversy pertaining to payment of electric bill. From the record as well as submissions the complainant availed supply since Oct-2007 and as per N.A. there were arrears after Oct-2010. The complainants grievance is about not issuing of correct bills and not allowing to avail Krushi Sanjivani Scheme. The copies of such provisional bills under said scheme have been produced by the complainant and stating that those bills under Krushi Sanjivani Scheme were given at about 4:45 p.m.on dt. 31/03/2015, which was the last date of the said scheme. The record clearly shows the complainant has given letters in that respect but there was no reply, from N.A.’s side. During course of arguments it revealed that the said scheme is in operation. The N.A. to issue bills with all details including the meter reading so that the further grievance can be avoided, where by Krushi Sanjivani Scheme can be made applicable to the complainant and there by the arrears of revenue of the N.A. could be collected and in future proper bills with actual reading can be issued. The same bill avoid further grievance in that respect.

5. As far as claim of the complainant for Rs.300000/- of loss of crop, suffice to say that the same is not tenable. In any case there is iota of evidence in support of such claim, Hence the same cannot be granted. That there is no steno, typist available in the office since long, Even part time typist, on job basis, was not available since last number of days hence the order could not be passed early, within the stipulated period. Hence the following unanimous order.

### **ORDER**

1. That the complaint no. 34/2015 is disposed of with direction to the N.A. to issue bills of arrears with all details including Meter reading, as per Krushi Sanjivani Scheme well within the period so that complainant can avail the benefit there of. The revenue of the licensee could be collected thereby.
2. The claim of the complainant for SOP compensation and loss of crop are hereby rejected.
3. That the compliance report to the submitted within a period of one month from this order.

S/d  
Member/ Secretary

S/d  
Member (CPO)

S/d  
Chairman

TO  
The Nodal Officer,  
Executive Engineer  
MSEDCL,Division Circle  
Achalput.

The order passed on 06/02/2016 in the Complaint No. 34/2015, is enclosed herewith for further compliance and necessary action.

**Secretary,**  
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,  
MSEDCL, Akola Zone, Akola

**Copy fwc to:**

1. Superintending Engineer, MSEDCL O&M Circle, Amravati.
2. Sou. Savita Kundan Zade.