

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AMRAVATI ZONE, AMRAVATI**

'Vidyut Bhavan', Shivaji Nagar, Amravati: 444603, Tel. No. 0721 2551158

Order

Dt. 30 /12/2017

Complaint No. 15/2017

In the matter of grievance pertaining to difference in Fixed Charges due to wrong feeding of connected load and billing thereof.

Quorum

**Dr. Vishram Nilkanth Bapat, Chairman
Shri D.B. Mohod, Member Secretary
Sau. Sushama Joshi, Member (CPO)**

In the matter of

M/s Princess

Prop. Shri Sudhir Wasudeo Khemachandani

Jaistambha Chowk, Amravati.

C.No. LT -366470920500

Complainant

.....Vs.....

Respondent

The Executive Engineer

MSEDCL, Urban Division, Amravati.

Appearances:-

Complainant Representative:-

Shri Sudhir W. Khemachandani

Respondent Representative:-

Shri. Prashant Gayakwad

Additional Executive Engineer

Amravati Ull Sub Division .

Being aggrieved by IGRC, Amravati Order dt.16/05/2017, complainant approached to CGRF for redressal of his grievance on dt.15/07/2017 and filed his complaint which is registered as Case no.15/2017.

1) As per complainant consumer, he applied for new electric connection for his Shop named and styled as Princess Saree , applied for load of 32 Kw. and accordingly N.A.MSEDCL sanctioned power supply for 32 Kw.

2) Complainant / consumer submitted that the power supply with sanctioned load of 32 Kw was released on 21/06/1994 and thereafter he is paying regular energy bill which he receives.

3) Complainant /consumer submitted that N.A. MSEDCL asked him to pay penalty amount for use of additional load vide letter No.6130 in Dec.2015 and he also confirm about application of 32 Kw in reply for same letter .

4) Complainant / consumer submitted that he received energy bill of Rs.247200/-from MSEDCL on dt.18/04/2016 with fact specifying that it is the tariff difference bill of Fixed Charges for sanctioned load of 32 Kw. which was wrongly feeded in computer billing system as 0.32 Kw from the period of June 2008 to April 2009 and 0.50 Kw for period of May 2009 to Jan 2016.

5) In his further submission complainant consumer submitted that he received reminder letter from MSEDCL along with disconnection notice for Rs.247197.68/- under section 56(1) of Electricity Act 2003 on

dt.02/08/2016. Complainant asked for the details regarding tariff difference of bill as he has not understood the fact about such huge outstanding bill vide his application dt 12/08/2016 mentioning that he is ready to pay if it is consistent with law and provision. Again complainant receives notice under section 56(1) of Electricity Act 2003 on dt 04/10/2016 for payment of outstanding bill as on date. In response to said disconnection notice complainant submitted letter dt.26/10/2016 to MSEDCL that he received table showing calculation of tariff difference bill but he needs further eight more days to understand and again assured that he is ready to pay if it is consistent with law and provision with request not to disconnect supply. Now again complainant received disconnection notice and it was served after deciding complaint before District Consumer Redressal Forum, Amravati stating that pay the enclosed bill of Jan-2017 of amount Rs.191830/-.

Aggrieved by this, complainant consumer approached to IGRC, Amravati for redressal of his grievance and accordingly complaint is decided by IGRC, Amravati and Order passed on dt.16/05/2017 stating that tariff difference bill is correct and shall be paid by consumer.

Aggrieved by order of IGRC, Amravati dt 16/05/2017, complainant filed his complaint to CGRF, Amravati on dt 15/07/2017. Complainant during his oral submission in hearing before this Forum, stated that what stated in written complaint is to be treated as oral submission. In the complaint he has mentioned references of Hon. Ombudsman, Mumbai's verdict and enclosed verdict in WP No.10764 in Bombay High Court and H.D.Shourie Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi ,MANU/DE/0356.1987. But complainant neither explained application of referred verdict nor enclosed verdict to his complainant.

During hearing, complainant submitted Order passed by same Forum on dt 23/12/2016 in Complaint No.16/2016 and 17/2016 and submitted that these were the identical cases of recovering old dues

