

**BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM**  
**AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD**

Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/2005/ 13  
Date of Filing: 21.10. 2005.  
Date of Decision: 16.12.2005

**Mrs. Sukhda Shirish patel** - **The Consumer**  
**Complainant.**

**R/o plot No.43,Gangasagar Society,Paithan Road,**  
**Nakshtrawadi, Aurangabad**

V/s

**MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY**  
**DISTRIBUTION COMPANY LTD. ( MSEDCL)**

Sub: Grievance under the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory  
Commission,(Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum  
and Ombudsman) Regulations 2003

1. The consumer complainant Mrs. Sukhda Shirish .Patel ( Con.No. 490360003091) has filed her grievance in Annexure “ A “ before this Forum on 21.10.2005 under regulation No. 6.5 of The Regulations 2003. A copy of the grievance was forwarded on 21.10.05 to the Nodal officer and Executive Engineer (Adm) in the office of the Superintending Engineer, Urban Aurangabad with a request to furnish his response on the grievance within fifteen days and hearing in the matter was fixed on 08.11..05.
2. The grievance of the consumer in brief is as stated below.  
The Consumer has taken electrical connection for her residence at Plot No.43, Gangasagar Society, Paithan Road, Nakshtrawadi, Aurangabad. It is contended that in the bill for the month of March/April 2005 ( 25.02.05 to 26.04.05) the meter reading shown was 9849 and 9937 respectively and she

was charged for only 88 units, where as actual meter reading as on 26.04.05 was 10462 and she accordingly brought it to the notice of the concerned Dy. Executive Engineer, who corrected the bill treating current reading up to 10462 and the original bill for 88 units which was for Rs. 300 / was corrected by adding Rs. 1500/ and thus making it for Rs. 1800/. The consumer contended that she paid the bill i.e. Rs. 1800/ ,

cont:

page 2

However in the next bill which was for 26.04.05 to 30.06.05, the meter reading was shown to be 9937 & 11035 respectively, showing electricity use of 1098 units and the bill was for Rs. 3600/, which included load management charges of Rs. 785/

In the next bill for 30.07.05 to 30.08.05 the meter reading was shown to be 11202 and 11322 respectively showing use of electricity for 120 units. In the next bill i.e. for 30.08.05 to 30.09.05 the house was shown to be locked and she was charged for 414 units per month on average basis and the bill amount was shown to be Rs. 6510/ inclusive of interest, DPC, arrears etc. The contention of the consumer that the meter reading 10462 was not considered in the next bill and because of wrong reading the bill ( 1098 units) was inflated and that is why she did not pay it. It is also contended that she represented the matter to the Dy. Ex. Engineer on 16.07.05 but with no results. It is also contended that the consumer filed her grievance before IGRC on 21.07.05 and that to with no results what so ever. The consumer therefore requested for issue of direction to the Distribution licensee. to correct all the bills subsequent to meter reading 10462.

3. On the date of hearing i.e. 8.11.05, the consumer and her representative were present. However no body was present on behalf of Distribution Licensee. The Nodal Officer did not

file

any response before or on the date of hearing. The representative of consumer was heard. Since the Nodal Officer was not present, ex-parte proceedings were ordered . However the Nodal Officer after three days of the hearing filed his response to the grievance . The response is very cryptic and it is stated therein that due to wrong reading/feeding there was accumulated consumption in June 05 –as the remittance of correct reading amount of consumer was credited in his next bill. It is also further stated that consumption recorded for April to June 2005 ,bifurcated in three months and bill revision of credit of Rs. 1347/ is given and revised bill is sent to consumer.

Cont:

Page 3

4. The consumer has filed copies of the bills as enumerated below.

Sr.No.	Previous		current		units	Amount in Rs.
	Date	Reading	Date	Reading		
1.	23.02.05	9849	26.04.05	9937	88	300=00

2.	26.04.05	9937	30.06.05	11035	1098
3600=0					
3.	30.07.05	11202	30.08.05	11322	120
4800=0					
4.	30.08.05	11322	30.09.05	Locked	414
6510=0					

On going through the original bill at Sr.No.1 we find that though the bill was issued up to 9937 units , the bill was corrected taking current reading up to 10462 and the original bill amount of Rs. 300/ was enhanced up to Rs. 1800/ which the consumer paid. The correction appears to have been done by the Dy. Ex. Engineer however the next bill ( at Sr.No.2 above) displayed previous reading as 9937 instead of 10462 which was corrected by the DYEE himself. As a result the consumer was charged for 1098 units though she should have been charged for 573 units as she was charged for 525 units in the previous bills. No doubt the consumer is given setoff of Rs.1500/ which she has paid for previous bill, but because electricity consumption was shown for 1098 units, the consumer was charged Rs.785/ for load management charges. As a matter of fact had the correct reading been taken into consideration so far as the bills were concerned ( which actually has been taken into consideration while accepting payment from the consumer the consumer has been subjected to Load Management charges. Therefore the charging of LMC to the consumer does not appear to be justified . In this bill ( Sr.No.2) the bimonthly unit consumption for Feb & April 05 has been shown as 107 & 88 units respectively. As a matter of fact for calculating average monthly consumption, the actual consumption for last six months should have been considered . The bill for sept.( 30.08.05 to 30.09.05) is given on average basis and is for 414 units as the house is shown to be locked. In the bill bimonthly units shown for Aug/July/June/April & Feb..05 are 120/167/1098/88/& 107 units respectively. As a matter of fact up to June 05 the bills were issued on bimonthly reading basis and from July 05 onwards it is on monthly reading basis. Considering this aspect, the monthly average consumption comes to 245 units per month and not 414 as shown to have been charged in the bill.

Cont.

6. The consumer on 16.7.05 has applied to Dy. Ex. Engineer stating that she has paid charges up to 10462 reading and the units 1098 for which she is charged should be bifurcated in four months. The consumer has also filed her grievance before Internal Grievance Redressal Committee ( I.G.R.C.) on 21.7.05 but no heed of her grievance was taken by IGRC. The response filed by the Nodal Officer as stated above is very cryptic & fails to convey the exact contention of the Distribution licensee to the grievance para wise. Therefore we are of the opinion that the consumer is made to suffer financially because of the mistake on the part of concerned official of the Distribution licensee.

**Therefore it is ordered that**

1. **The bill ending June 05 ( for 1098 units) should be bifurcated in four months i.e. March to June 05 and revised bill shall be issued to the consumer.**
2. **The load management charges charged shall be waived off**
3. **The bill for Sept.05( for 414 units) shall be recalculated considering actual consumption in preceding six months and bill shall be issued based on the monthly average consumption.**
4. **While issuing the corrected bill as shown above, no DPC, Interest , penal charges etc shall be charged .**
5. **After the rectified corrected bill is issued , consumer shall pay the bill within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of the bill and till the expiry of such period the electricity connection of the consumer should not be cutoff.**

**The Distribution Licensee .& the consumer shall comply**

with the above order and report compliance to the  
Forum.

Inform the parties and close the case.

(H.A.KAPADIA) ( V.G.JOSHI) ( R.K.PINGLE)  
MEMBER MEMBER SECRETARY CHAIRMAN