

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD.

Date of Admission. 07.09.2012.

Date of decision. 11.12.2012

Case No. CGRF /AZ/Aur/Jalna/405/2012/38

Executive Director, **COMPLAINANT.**  
Shri Rameshwar Co- Operative Sugar Factory,  
Raosaheb Nagar, Tq.Bhokardan,  
Dist..Jalna.

VERSUS.

Assistant Engineer, **RESPONDENT.**  
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co,  
Sub-Division Bhokardan

Flying Squad parbhani

Grievance :- Against the Electricity Bills Dated 25.06.2012  
Amounting to Rs. 12,58,870/-

**CORAM:**

Shri V.B.Mantri Chairperson

Shri V.S.Kabra Member.

Shri S.K.Narwade Member/Secretary

The complainant has presented his grievance before this Forum against the Electricity Bills issued by the respondents amounting to Rs. 12,58,870/- on 25.06.2012. The case of the complainant in brief is that, the complainant is the consumer of the respondent MSEDCL

bearing consumer No 514610401302. The connection was taken on 02.08.2012.

On 13.06.2012 the flying Squad parbhani, had inspected the meter and noted down connected load to be 52 KVA in place of sanctioned load of 25HP. The meter reading was noted to be 2,57.116.48 K VH. The previous noted reading was 49,200/- for the period for Oct. 2010 that is for the period of 8 years. The respondent Company has then issued Bills on average basis

The meter was tested at Aurangabad on 14.06.2012, and found that the meter was old one and noticed edging defects. The respondents on receiving meter resting reports, issued the disputed Bills amounting to Rs.12,58,870/- on 25.06.2012, for the period of 19 months.

It is the grievance of the consumer that in case the meter was out dated, the respondents should have replaced the meter. The respondents should have taken meter reading periodically. The respondents should not have issued bills on average basis. There was Load shedding in rural area and therefore there was no question to consume Electricity to the extend to which the Bills have been given. The disputed Bills therefore required to be cancelled.

The respondents MSEDCL have submitted the reply to the complaint through the Nodal Officer. It has been submitted that, The Flying squad inspected the meter on 13.06.2012 and noticed the accumulated reading of 207916/- The meter was tested at Aurangabad in testing Division and it was found functioning properly, The Company has thereby issued the bills of accumulated meter reading

by deducting the bills of paid units. The consumption was properly recorded in the meter. The meter reading is acceptable to the complainant. The Bills are issued as per meter reading. There is no substance in the complaint so it should be dismissed.

This Forum heard the submission of the representative of the complainant, MR Dayashankar Ramdevsingh. The Nodal Officer argued the case of the respondents.

The Nodal Officer has submitted that though the meter of old make but there was no defect in meter or meter reading. The meter was functioning properly. The Bills are regarding the Electricity consumption.

The submissions on behalf of the complainant are that, the meter was defective. As per C.P.L. was shown faulty. Complainant has informed to the respondents regarding faulty meter. The Bills are a such faulty. The bills should be therefore cancelled.

The complainant did not produce any record to show that, The complainant has ever informed to the MSEDCL regarding faulty meter. The copy of the Flying Squad report has been filed. On going through the flying Squad report, it does not reveal that the meter was in any way defective so as to record faulty consumption. The complainant is bound pay the Bills of the Electricity to which it has consumed. The defect which this Forum is noticed is not in the functioning of the meter but in the functioning of the respondents for not recording the meter reading periodically and in issuing the Bills as per meter recording time to time, which cropped up the present dispute. There is no explanation on behalf of the respondents as to why the respondents could not issue the bills as per meter reading

time to time and as to why for preceded in issuing the bills on average basis for such long period. The respondents then proceeded in charging DPC and interest. The complainant is not responsible for delay in payments and such the complainant is not responsible for interest for such delay. The said sum of DPC and interest if any and other chares as is charged, is required to be deducted from the Bills. The respondent has charged D.P.C. as Rs 22964/- and the sum of Rs. 184181/- has been charged as other charges. The said sum should be deducted from the disputed bill. This Forum is not in agreement with the complainant that the meter was faulty and thereby the Bills are faulty. There is no evidence to support of the said submission. No other points have been submitted. Hence Forum proceed to pass following order.

#### ORDER

The grievance is partly allowed.

The respondent shall deduct the sum of Rs. 22,964/- as charged for C.P.C. and the sum of Rs 184181/- as charged for other charges and interest if charged be deducted from the bills. Revised bill be issued accordingly.

The rest of part of the bill is confirmed.

No order as to cost of proceedings.

( V.S. Kabra. )  
Member

( S.K. Narwade )  
Member/Secretary.

( V.B. Mantri. )  
Chairperson



