

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION COMPANY LTD.

Old Power House Premises, Dr. Ambedkar Road, Aurangabad. Phone: 0240 - 2336172

No:- CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/ 433 / 2013 /17

Date :-

To,
01) The Executive Engineer (Administration)
Nodal Office, O/O Superintending Engineer ,
O&M Urban Circle, M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Aurangabad.

02) The Dy. General Manager(Planning)
GTL Ltd., T-9 Software Technology Park,
MIDC Chikalthana, Opp: ESI Hospital,
Aurangabad.

Sub:- Forwarding of grievance in respect of Shri Balaji Hanmantrao
Bhagat, Plot No 32, Sarve No 23/24 , Parijat Nagar, N-4 , CIDCO,
Aurangabad. (Consumer No. 490012511806)

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the grievance application received by the Forum, in respect of Shri Balaji Hanmantrao Bhagat, Plot No 32, Sarve No 23/24 Parijat Nagar, N-4 , CIDCO, Aurangabad.

You are requested to submit your para wise reply on the grievance at the time of hearing. The hearing in the matter will be held on 30.04.2013 at 11.30 Hours.

Member/Secretary
CGRF(AZ) MSEDCL

Encl: As above

Copy to:-

Shri Balaji Hanmantrao Bhagat,
Plot No 32, Sarve No 23/24,
Parijat Nagar, N-4 , CIDCO,
Aurangabad.

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD.

Date of Admission. 09.04.2013.

Date of decision. 04.06.2013

Case No. CGRF /AZ/U/433/2013/17

1. Balaji s/o Hanmantrao Bhagat, **COMPLAINANT.**
Age 35 Years, Occ. Service,
R/o Plot No. 32 Sy. No. 23/ 24,
Om- Co- Op. Housing Society,
Priyat-Nagar, N-4, CIDCO, AURANGABAD.

VERSUS.

The Dy. General Manager(Planning)
GTL Ltd., T-9 Software Technology Park,
MIDC Chikalhana, Opp: ESI Hospital, Aurangabad.

2. Executive Engineer,(Adm.) **RESPONDENT.**
Nodal Officer,
O&M Urban Circle,
MSEDCL, AURANGABAD.

CORAM:

Shri V.B.Mantri Chairperson
Shri V.S.Kabra Member.
Shri S.K.Narwade Tech. Member.

REDRESSAL - DECISION.

1. The grievance of the complainant is against the bill of Rs. 26,320 issued in the month of August 2012. and against non issue of monthly bills regularly irrespective repeated requests.

2. The case of the complainant in brief is that, the complainant is the consumer of the respondent bearing consumer NO. 490012511806. The electric supply was started to the complainant with effect from August 2010. He however did not receive the electric bills. On enquiry with the respondent, it was represented to him that period of two three months may require to issue bills for new consumer. On completion of five months the complainant made application to that effect on 24.2.2011.. The complainant persuaded his request but there was no response from the respondent. The complainant thereby again filed another application on 13.5.2011 and persuaded his request. The respondent however did not consider his request of issuance of the bill. It is the case of the complainant that he continued to follow up his request of issue of monthly bill even though he met with accident and filed number of applications to that effect however there was no response to the requests of the complainant. Lastly he received the disputed bill for the sum of Rs. 26320/- showing the arrears of the bill for the period of 12 months. The respondents then proceeded to cut off the supply for non payment of the said bill.. It is the grievance of the complainant that he was required to suffer of cut of the supply for his no fault or due to the fault of the respondent regarding non issue of monthly bills regularly. The complainant has thereby claimed compensation regarding his harassments physically and mentally due wrong action of the respondent.
3. It is submitted by the complainant that he made his grievance before the IGRC. The IGRC partially redressed his grievance. The IGRC bifurcated his bills in 24 months instead of 12 months and

gave slab- benefit. The IGRC however did not deduct interest amount or D.P.C. and did not compensate his mental and physical harassments. The grievance of the complainant as such is to deduct the interest and D.P.C. and grant compensation as per MERC regulations.

4. The respondents MSEDCL has submitted reply and thereby submitted that, the respondent MSEDCL has no knowledge regarding the events what had happened.
5. The respondent GTL has submitted the reply and thereby submitted that the bill is issued as per meter reading. The complainant did not produce evidence regarding the date of supply. The IGRC has given slab benefit of 14 months. The complainant has not paid current bills therefore he is liable to pay interest. The complaint should be therefore dismissed.
6. This Forum heard submissions of both Nodal Officers for MSEDCL and GTL. And submissions of the Complainant.
7. The following points arise for the determinations of the Forum and findings of the Forum are as follows.

POINTS.	FINDINGS.
---------	-----------

- | | |
|---|------|
| 1. Whether, the respondents are required to deduct interest and D.P.C.? | Yes. |
| 2. Whether the complainant is entitled for compensation. | Yes. |
| 3. What Redressal | |

As follows.

REASONS.

8. There is no dispute that the respondents did not issue monthly bills to the complainant. There is no dispute that the complainant repeatedly requested to the respondents for issue of the bills. The complainant has filed the office copies of the request letters submitted by the complainant to the respondents requesting repeatedly to issue the bills. It is further admitted fact that the respondent did not issue the bill even after such repeated requests. Admittedly the respondent then issued the disputed bill in the month of August 2012 for the sum of Rs. 26,320/-. Admittedly the bill was shown to be the arrears of Rs. 112 months instead of 24 months. Admittedly the IGRC then considered the grievance of the complainant and gave slab benefit of 24 months to the complainant. Admittedly the respondent has cut of the electricity supply of the complainant, on the count that the complainant did not make payment of current bills. The question before this forum is how far the action of the respondent is justified in disconnecting the supply of the complainant, when he him self prosecuting for issuance of the bills continuously by filing repeated applications even though he met with accident. The complainant has filed medical papers and office copies of his complaints so made to the respondents. The respondent MSEDCL on the other hand submitted that the MSEDCL has no knowledge of events what had happened. The respondent GTL on the other hand issued the bills

showing arrears of 12 months in place of 24 months ignoring to give slab benefit of 24 months and further proceeded to cut of the supply. It is thus clear case of harassment to the complainant and sufferings to him due to non action of the respondents and their carelessness, which makes the complainant entitled for compensation as per MERC regulations. However considering the fact that IGRC has taken partial cognizance of the mistake which occurred and giving relief of slab benefit of 24 months, this forum is inclined to grant token compensation of Rs. 2000/- due cutting of electricity and non issuance of monthly bills even after repeated requests instead of granting compensation as per MERC ratio. The respondents has charged interest of Rs. 618 /-and D.P.C. of Rs. 34/-even though slab benefit is given. The respondent GTL should thereby deduct the said amount in next bills. With these reasons and finding the Forum proceeds to pass following order.

ORDER.

1. The grievance of the complainant is allowed as follows.
 - A. The respondent GTL shall deduct the sum of Rs. 618 as levied towards interest and the sum of Rs. 34/- as levied towards D.P.C. in disputed bill in forthcoming bills.
 - B. The respondent GTL shall give compensation of Rs. 2000/- to the complainant either in cash or by giving benefit in coming bills of the complainant.

Sd/-
(S.K.Narwade.)
Member/Secretary

Sd/-
(V.S. Kabra.)
Member

Sd/-
(V.B.Mantri.)
Chairperson.

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited
Aurangabad Zone, Aurangabad.

Old Power House Premises, Dr.Ambedkar Road, Aurangabad. Phone No.2336172

No: CGRF /AZ/U/433/2013/17

Date :-

To,

1. Balaji s/o Hanmantrao Bhagat,
Age 35 Years, Occ. Service,
R/o Plot No. 32 Sy. No. 23/ 24,
Om- Co- Op. Housing Society,
Prijat-Nagar, N-4, CIDCO,
AURANGABAD.
- 02) The Dy. General Manager(Planning)
GTL Ltd., T-9 Software Technology Park,
MIDC Chikalhana, Opp: ESI Hospital,
Aurangabad.
2. Executive Engineer,(Adm.)
Nodal Officer,
O&M Urban Circle,
MSEDCL, AURANGABAD.

Sub:- Grievance in Case No. CGRF /AZ/U/433/2013/17

Please find enclosed herewith a copy of the order passed by the Forum in the case mentioned above. The consumer, if not satisfied with the decision of the Forum, is at liberty to make a representation to the Electricity Ombudsman, the contact details of whom is as under, within a period of 60 days from the date of this order.

Encl: As above

Member/Secretary,
CGRF(AZ) MSEDCL,
Aurangabad

Copy submitted with respect to:-

The Chief Engineer(AZ)
MSEDCL, Aurangabad.

Contact details of:

The Electricity Ombudsman,
Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni, Nagpur – 440 013
Phone No.(Office) (0712) 20 22 198, E-mail – cgrfnz@gmail.in