

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

**Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/27/ 2006/ 07**

**Date of Filing: 17.08.06.**

**Date of Decision: 25.09.06**

**Shri - S Rajgopal  
Con.No.(490010681526)**

**The Consumer  
Complainant.**

**2-8-31, Aurangpura, 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 2006

- 1.** The consumer has filed his grievance in Annexure “ A “ before this Forum on **17.8.06** under regulation No. 6.10 of the Regulations referred to above. A copy of the grievance was forwarded on 17.08.06 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 a period of fifteen days and hearing in the matter was fixed on **04.09.06**.
- 2.** The grievance of the consumer, in brief, as per consumer, is as stated below.

The consumer is having electrical connection for commercial purpose in the name of his father. He has paid electricity bills till June 2005 as the same were received as per meter readings. For the period **27.04.05 to 29.06.05** , he was issued two bills for the same period. One was for Rs.1700/ which was paid by him on 21.07.05 and second bill was issued striking the previous bill of Rs.1700/ and amount shown on the bill was **Rs.11030/** , the bill being hand written and was supplementary assessment bill. The consumer requested the concerned authorities of the Distribution Licensee by his letter dt.**10.11.05, 26.06.05 and 28.07.06** to give the details of the supplementary assessment bill , but no details were provided to him. On 15.03.06, the Jr. Engineer visited his shop for disconnecting the supply .The consumer told him that no details

were provided to him , however Jr. Engineer asked him to pay the bill in part and assured him that the details will be provided to him within 2-3 days. On this assurance and to avoid disconnection he paid **Rs.10000/** as part payment. Irrespective of assurance given to him no details were provided to him and the balance amount was being reflected in every subsequent bill.

2006/7

-----

1 / 4

“2”

- 3 The consumer by his letters dt. 26.6.06 and 28.7.06 again requested for issuing correct bills by providing details of assessment and copy of CPL. However the same were not supplied to him. On 01.07.06 the supply of consumer was disconnected .On contacting the Dy. Ex. Engineer, he was told to pay balance amount first and then only his complaint will be considered. Since no alternative was left the consumer paid the balance amount of Rs.12020/ and his supply was restored next day. The consumer has therefore requested the Forum to issue necessary instruction to the Distribution Licensee for issuing correct bill as per meter reading , to provide details of assessment , CPL , to refund excess amount paid by him and to pay compensation for wrongly disconnecting the supply.
4. On the date of hearing i.e. on 04.09.06 , the consumer was present. The Nodal Officer was not present. No body else on behalf of Distribution Licensee was present. No response on the grievance of the consumer was filed on behalf of Distribution Licensee. Therefore  
Ex-parte proceedings were ordered against the Distribution Licensee and the matter was reserved for decision with directives to call CPL assessment details etc. After pursuing the matter 2-3 times , the CPL, and the other documents called for were received.
5. On going through the grievance and the CPL & other documents submitted by the Distribution. Licensee , we find that the consumer has been charged supplementary bill for 22 months at the rate of 175 units consumption per month and the amount charged is Rs.11028/. From the supplementary bill we find that the consumer was charged for  $175 \times 22 = 3850$  units. The consumer was already charged for 1117 units and after deducting the charged units the

supplementary bill was issued for 2733 units which was for Rs.11028/ .

6. On going through the documents submitted by the D.L. we find that that on 08.04.05 , a new meter bearing Sr.No. 00879784 was installed in series/parallel with the existing meter bearing Sr.No. 89-041136. We also find that the Jr. Engineer inspected the old meter on 8.6.05 and in his report has mentioned the meter to be slow by 45% and hence recommended to charge consumer at the rate of 175 units per month since Aug.2003. On going through the CPL we find that the previous and current reading of the old meter shown therein is 6655 and 6677 units respectively. In other words which would go to show that the meter was not working properly. The figures of readings ( previous and current reading) appear to be the same i.e. 6677 & 6677 for subsequent months .In other words it would mean that the meter was faulty, though in CPL the status of meter is shown to be NORMAL .

2006/7

-----

2 / 3

“3”

7. It appears that the reading recorded on 08.04.05 to 18.06.05 for both old and new meter were observed and the difference between the readings of these two meters was considered for arriving at the assessment figure of 175 units per month. The period during which the difference between the reading of two meter was considered was not correct .In fact the old meter should have been tested in laboratory to find out the extent of the slowness. The old meter does not appear to have been tested in the laboratory. The DL ,in fact should have tested the meter and based on the findings of the test report should have raised the supplementary assessment bill. The DL, instead of that has resorted to giving series/parallel meter and after observing the difference between the readings of old & new meter , has raised the supplementary bill considering consumption of 175 units per month. Since the old meter is not tested for finding out the extent of slowness, we have no

alternative but to considered the difference between the readings of the old & new meter. We therefore reluctantly accept the observations of the DL in this regard

8. The consumer, I his grievance , has contended that he has paid the bills till the month of June 05 ( the disputed period) as the same were issued as per meter reading. On going through the CPL we find that the consumer is charged for 12 units once , 358 units three times , 31 units once and for the rest of the period of the disputed period for zero units. Therefore the contention of consumer is not correct and can not be accepted .On going through the document submitted by the DL it is also seen that while charging at the rate of 175 units per month for the disputed period the units for which the consumer is already charged i.e. 1117 units have been deducted while rasing the supplementary bill.

In view of the above observation we are of the opinion that the grievance has no merit and deserves to be dismissed. Hence the following order.

### **ORDER**

**The grievance of the consumer is dismissed**

Inform the parties and close the case.

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

2006/7

-----

3 / 3