

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

*“Vidyut Bhavan”
Ratanlal Plots,
Akola: 444 001
Tel.No.2434476*

January 15,2014.

Complaint No.101/2013

In the matter of grievance about excessive elec. bills with other reliefs

Quorum :

Shri T.M.Mantri,	Chairman
Shri A.S.Gade,	Member
Shri P.B.Pawar,	Secretary

Sunil R. Agrawal, Ramnagar Akola

... Complainant

...VS...

The Executive Engineer, (U)MSEDCL, Akola

... Respondent

Appearances:

Complainant Representative: Shri Sunil R.Agrawal

Respondent Representative: Shri G.S.Rahate, Dy.E.E. MSEDCL Akola

1. The complainant has raised the grievance aggrieved by the decision of the N.A. communicated by communication dt. 24.10.13 that the bill issued to the complainant of June,13 was correct. The meter has already been replaced in August,13.
2. According to the complainant the N.A. has not examined the record and wrongly held that the bill in question was of the period for two months.

Reference has been made to bill issued on 16/5/13 which was deposited by the complainant on 30/5/13. It is alleged that in the subsequent bill issued there was mistake but permission was granted for depositing Rs.8600/-. It is alleged that the next bill received by the complainant was also deposited. According to the complainant the stand taken by the N.A.is totally incorrect and false hence it has approached the authority. According to the complainant the average monthly consumption is between 600 to 700 units except in the month of April and July,13. Though the complainant has submitted complaint for the alleged excessive bill and deposited Rs.500/- towards meter testing charges, his grievance has not been resolved inspite approaches to the concerned authority. The complainant is regularly depositing all the bills inspite thereof notice under Section 56(i) of Electricity Act came to be issued threatening disconnection, hence the complainant is approaching the authority and the complainant is ready to deposit amount of bill if it is correct.

3. It is alleged that though there is reference of checking of the meter by testing unit but it was not effected, no communication was given to the complainant in that respect, in any case such testing is not correct and final. According to the complainant there was defect in the meter and excessive bill came to be issued.

4. Reference has been made to bill of June,2012 for 2450 units without any dispute but that does not mean consumption in June can be of such higher units and lastly prayed for the reliefs as sought for. Alongwith the complaint copies of documents have been annexed.

5 Notice as per regulation issued to the N.A. for submitting reply to the complaint. Reply came to be filed, stating that the sanction load of the complainant is 5.0 KW. After receipt of communication of the complainant in respect of bill of June 13 detailed inspection was carried out by J.E. and it was noticed that the total connected load is of 9.0 KW and details of the usage instruments in the premises have been given.

6 It is stated that the impugned bill dt. 17/7/13 is for the period 02/05/13 to 02/06/13 however bill of May,13 was issued on average basis so adjustment of Rs.5,665.18 was given. The bill of 4765 units was for two months. In the month of May and June,13 as there was user of ACs the consumption was more but the grievance of the complainant that it was excessive and incorrect. Copies of the bills have been annexed with reply.

7 It is stated that when the checking unit has checked the meter of the complainant it was found that it was -1.48 slow which means as per the rules within limit and was OK. The testing report dt. 23/8/13 clearly mentions the same and copy is annexed with the reply.

8 It is stated that on scrutiny of the CPL of last three years it was found that the average consumption of electric during the months of May, June and July is more and details thereof have been given with further averments that these figures clearly show that the consumption of electric in June,13 was not excessive. The N.A. has also given details of the payment made by the complainant for the electric bills of these three months in the past also. The complainant has never made any grievance in respect of the bills. The concerned meter has shown consumed units of 1014 for July,13

which clearly shows that it was properly working. The bill in question was issued as per actual consumption and it is correct hence complaint is liable to be dismissed. Copies of bunch of documents came to be filed with reply so also copy of CPL. Matter was then posted for arguments.

9 Heard, complainant in person and Shri Rahate, Dy.E.E. the learned representative of the N.A. at length. Additional documents came to be filed from the side of the complainant alongwith notes of arguments and the N.A. has also produced copies of postal receipts about sending of letters to the complainant, with copy of test report. Copies of which have been given to the complainant.

10 During the course of arguments the complainant's grievance was that there could not have been such consumption of 4765 units and the impugned bill is incorrect which needs to be corrected. He has also submitted that the subsequent bills have been received and have been paid. It has been submitted on behalf of the N.A. that spot inspection was carried out and this has been admitted by the complainant during course of arguments. The spot inspection report is on record wherein details of the various usage items are mentioned and the said report is signed from the side of the complainant. This has not been disputed from the side of the complainant. It is clear that apart from various usage items there are 3 ACs and 2 Gizers. No doubt the complainant has submitted that all of them are not used at one time. The learned representative of the N.A. has pointed out that even in the past the user of the electric consumption during the relevant period i.e. May, June and July of the premises of the complainant

is on higher side than that of user in remaining months. The learned representative of the non applicant has submitted that it is because of user of ACs, that has resulted in more consumption of units in these months.

11 The learned representative of the non applicant has further pointed out that the grievance of the complainant in respect of impugned bill is also not correct on other parts and drawn attention to the said bill. On going through the said bill and record, it is clear that the earlier bill of May,13 was on average basis, as is clear from the readings therein. In the impugned bill of June,13 the total units consumed is shown 4765 but it is for the period of two months. No doubt complainant has remitted the amount of earlier bill of May,13 which was for 689 units but in the subsequent bill of June,13 the column of "previous reading" shows that it was 98604, that was also the "previous reading" of May,13. In the bill of June 13 credit of Rs.5665.18 is given in front of "previous bill credit" so it is clear that whatever payment was made by the complainant towards bill of May,13 has been also considered and appropriate credit has been given. Needless to say that the fixed charges and electricity duty are levied monthly, irrespective of consumption of the units. So it is clear that in the bill of June,13 the amount deposited by the complainant for the earlier bill was taken into account. The copy of the meter testing report is also placed on record which was sent to the complainant and the complainant has admitted during course of arguments that he has received the meter testing report alongwith other documents. So apparently it is clear that the bill in question cannot be said to be excessive as is clear from the CPL, so also during course of arguments it has been submitted on behalf of N.A. that

after receipt of the complaint of the complainant the earlier meter was taken for checking/inspection and the new meter was installed. The readings therein under CPL and the bills issued to the complainant tallies so also dates of payment of the electric bills by the complainant. Admittedly complainant has deposited the amount of electric bills. In view thereof there is no question of disconnection of electric supply and during the course of arguments the learned representative of the N.A. has admitted that in view of receipt of payment, the notice in question will not to be acted upon. So the record clearly shows that there was more consumption of electricity during the relevant period as it was so in the past years also. Hence the say of the complainant that impugned bill in question was incorrect/excessive cannot, be said to be just and proper. Consequently the complainant is not entitled for the reliefs prayed for and the complaint is liable to be disposed off accordingly. This Forum therefore proceeds to pass following order, unanimously.

ORDER

- 1 The complainant No.101/2013 filed by the complainant is hereby dismissed.
- 2 In the circumstances parties to bear their own costs.

Sd/-
(A.S.Gade)
Member

Sd/-
(P.B.Pawar)
Secretary

Sd/-
(T.M.Mantri)
Chairman