

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

**Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/659/2017/52
Registration No. 2017120016**

Date of Admission : 05.12.2017

Date of Decision : 27.03.2018

Shri Mateenuddin Hameeduddin Quazi, : COMPLAINANT
CTS No. 4170, Plot No. 3-1-4,
Barudgar Nala,
Aurangabad 431201.
(Consumer No. 490018435427
& 490018435435)

VERSUS

The Executive Engineer (Admn) : RESPONDENT
Nodal Officer, MSEDCL, Urban Circle,
Aurangabad.

Complainant Representative : Shri Akhtar Ali
Respondent : Shri AP Shirole, Addl. EE,
Shahaganj, Sub Division.

CORAM

Smt. Shobha B. Varma, Chairperson
Shri Laxman M. Kakade, Member Secretary
Shri Vilaschandra S. Kabra Member.

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL DECISION

1) The applicant Shri Mateenuddin Hameeduddin Quazi, CTS No. 4170, Plot No. 3-1-4, Barudgar Nala, Aurangabad is a consumer of Mahavitaran having (Consumer No. 490018435427 & 490018435435). The applicant has filed a complaint against the respondent, the Executive Engineer i.e. Nodal Officer, MSEDCL, Urban Circle, Aurangabad under Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulation 2006 in Annexure (A) on 05.12.2017.

Brief History of the case :-

- 2) Petitioner has submitted that
- 1) That there is bill dispute regarding arrears shown on the bills wrongly and not withdraw since September 2017.
 - 2) Consumer personally approached to billing section, Shahaganj Sub Division, Aurangabad and requested to revise the bill as the arrears were wrongly shown in the current bill. This fact regarding revision of bill is well known to Shri Giri, Assstt. Engineer, City Chowk Unit, Aurangabad.
 - 3) That, Assistant Engineer, City Chowk Unit came for disconnection of above consumer. This fact of revision of bill was again brought to his notice. Consumer requested that, he is ready to pay current bill pending dispute and also requested not to disconnect the supply. But, Assistant Engineer, City Chowk Unit Aurangabad has disconnected the supply without giving any notice under Section 56 of Electricity Act, 2003. When consumer objected for disconnection without notice, Assistant Engineer informed that it is not possible to give notice under section 56 of Electricity Act, 2003 to each and every consumer.

- 4) Assistant Engineer, City Chowk Unit has violated the clause NO. 56 of Electricity Act, 2003 and disconnected the supply illegally putting consumer in dark, harassed and subjected to mental torture.
- 5) This matter regarding illegal disconnection without notice was taken up with Additional Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Shahganj Sub Division, Aurangabad in writing on 02.12.2017. But, No action is taken in this regard.

It is therefore prayed that :-

1. The arrears shown on the bills are in dispute. Consumer is ready to pay current bill for the month of October 2017 i.e. 1327/- and Rs. 619/- respectively, only keeping aside the disputed amount till settlement.
 2. Interim order of reconnection may be given to MSEDCL, in the name of natural justice and avoid hardship to the consumer who is in dark now.
 3. Assistant Engineer, MSEDCL, City Chowk, Aurangabad has disconnected the supply illegally without notice under section 56 of Electricity Act, 2003. Action may be taken under the provision of Electricity Act 2003 and directives from MERC.
 4. Compensation of Rs. 5000/- be awarded to the consumer for mental torture, mental agony, loss of prestige in public due to this illegal disconnection by Assistant Engineer, MSEDCL, City Chowk, Aurangabad.
- 3) Respondent has filed say (Page No. 12,15,50) & submitted that wrong bills were issued to the complainant for the period May 2016 to April 2017 (Consumer No. 490018435427) & for November 2015 to April 2017 (Consumer No. 490018435435). Provisional bills were issued to the complainant. Electricity supply was reconnected & bills will be corrected in January 2018. It is submitted that bills were deducted of Rs. 16,102.90 & Rs. 7054.95 respectively.

4) Say (Page No. 50), That the meter No. on disconnection report given by Section Engineer & Meter No. given on consumer ledger are different. Out of them meter No. shown by Section Engineer was correct, where as meter No. shown on ledger was wrong & this fact is transpired while inspecting the documents at Office. B-80 is proposed for the bill of Rs. 16,102.90, Rs. 7054.95 & for the bill of Rs. 3080.00 & Rs. 2120.00 respectively.

5) Say (Page No. 66, 68), as per spot inspection dtd. 16.02.2018 the new meter reading of Consumer No. 490018435427 is 356 Kwh & of 490018435435 is 1474 Kwh. Both Nos. are made PD to live in September 2017.

6) Say (Page No. 72) Electric supply was made to consumer No. 490018435435 through meter No. 4789263 & Consumer No. 490018435427 through Meter No 4789266. Accordingly there is entry made in issue register. However, then Assistant Engineer committed mistake while submitting online NSC. Therefore bills are issued to following four consumers with following meter Nos.

Sr. No.	Consumer No.	Meter No.
1	490018435435	1104665
2	490018435427	1105552
3	490018444639	4789263
4	490018445261	4789266

7) That on examining photos of consumer meters, they are not clear, meter No. & reading is not clear, so bill can't be issued on that basis. As per Spot inspection & use of New meter, bills of complainant may be corrected. As per use in the period May 2016 to April 2017 of Consumer No. 490018435427

considering use of 65 units per month and amount Rs. 8301.24 may be deducted. In respect of Consumer No. 490018435435, as per use of November 2015 to April 2017 use of 268 units per month, if calculated then amount of bill may be increased to the tune of Rs. 21,190.96, so bill revision may be sanctioned.

8) That on 30.01.2018, the matter was heard & posted for orders. However, while inspecting the documents, the proposed bills of Rs. 3,080/- (Consumer No. 490018435427) & of Rs. 2120/- (Consumer No. 190018435435), its calculation how arrived is not clear so, on 06.02.2018, query was raised by this Forum in this respect. Therefore, on 14.02.2018, Respondent Representative was called on to produce CPL & documents used for calculations. On 15.02.2018 those details are submitted by Respondent. Considering submission of documents, both parties are called upon for fresh hearing. Respondent Officer has submitted that opportunity may be given to him to find out photos of old meter, so that, he can produce it. So time was granted for production of photos & directions are also issued to examine new meter by acucheck etc. & so arguments were adjourned to 27.02.2018. Respondent has made submission on 27.02.2018. Consumer Representative Shri Ali requested for time & it was granted. Ultimately on 20.03.2018, fresh arguments of both parties are heard.

9) Consumer Representative Shri Ali has submitted rejoinder on 20.03.2018 (Page No. 80). It is stated that the revised proposed bill of Rs. 31,190/- (Consumer No. 490018435435) & of Rs. 12410/- (Consumer No. 490018435427) are wrong & after thought & issued as per directives of CGRF. The Respondent has changed the stand. The proposed bill of Rs. 3080/- & Rs. 2120/- was accepted by consumer & signed by Addl. Executive Engineer, Shahganj Sub Division, so there is no question of again revising bill and compensation may be awarded.

10) On going through the record, hearing both the parties, following points arise for our determination with our findings thereon for the reasons to follow:-

Sr. No.	POINTS	FINDINGS
1)	Whether the disputed bills of Consumer No. 490018435435 (Residential) & 490018435427 (Commercial) are requires to be revise?	Yes For purpose of Calculation committee be appointed.
2)	Whether there was illegal disconnection of both the above consumer nos. of the complainant?	Yes
3)	Whether the complainant is entitle for compensation of Rs. 5,000/- for illegal disconnection as prayed for ?	Compensation of Rs. 1,000/- is allowed.
4)	What order?	As per final order

REASONS

11) **Point No. 1 :-** New connection is released to consumer No. 490018435435 on 02.11.2015 for residence purpose. Consumer raised dispute for bills up to September 2017 saying these are wrong. He submitted bill copy of November 2017 showing arrears as Rs. 9,150/- and challenged it. Bill for month Sept. 2017 shows last payment on dtd 10.08.2017 Rs. 1,500/-

12) From observation of CPL, it is clear that connection is released with meter No 01104665. Permanent disconnection report (Page No. 71) shows meter No. 4789263 was removed of above consumer on dtd 02.06.2017. These facts reveal that Consumer was billed with wrong meter up to April 2017, consumer was PD for May 2017 to August 2017 (PD as per CPL). On dtd. 18.09.2017 consumer is reconnected (PD to live) with meter No. 40714877 (Page 55) but

again Bills issued on average basis. Hence bills up to November 2017 are incorrect and not acceptable, hence require to revise.

13) Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division has submitted proposed B-80 on 16.01.2018, stating that bills issued during November 2015 to April 2017 for consumer No. 490018435435 are wrong and not as per reading. Now as per consumer application and Assistant Engineer Report bill is revised from November 2015 to April 2017. Bill amount Rs. 7,054/ is revised ($6,122+932=Rs. 7,054/-$) from current bill. On dtd. 30.01.2018, he submitted proposed revised bill in the month of December 2017 i.e. Rs. 9,160/-revised to Rs. 2,120/-. He submitted that bill revision is proposed as per meter reading. Additional Executive Engineer Shahaganj Sub Division has submitted CPL and justification of B-80 on 15.02.2018 and again stated that bills issued for period November 15 to April 17 for above consumer are wrong not as per reading, bill is revised as per final reading showing 399 KWH on permanent disconnection report submitted by Assistant Engineer(Page 54) , i.e. 1 KWH to 399 KWH = 398 KWH units for 15 months i.e. 27 units per month consumption.

Meter No. shown on CPL and permanent disconnection report are different. Meter No. given by AE is correct and meter No. on CPL is wrong. Also submitted PD report and meter inspection report.

14) Proposed B-80 in the month of December 2017 i.e. Rs. 9,160/- revised to Rs. 2,120/-has following discrepancies.

1. Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division stated on dtd. 02.01.2018 that bills issued during November 2015 to April 2017 for consumer No. 490018435435 are wrong and not as per reading. Now as per consumer application and Assistant Engineer Report bill is revised from November 2015 to April 2017 and provisional bills are

- issued. Also stated that as per interim order of CGRF consumer paid above bills and reconnection charges, hence supply is reconnected, but fact is that CGRF passed interim order as “Keeping dispute amount aside & restore the supply after payment of all monthly current bills. Electricity supply shall be continued up to decision of Forum.” CGRF never passed interim order for specific bill revision. Additional Executive Engineer submitted irresponsible and incorrect statement.
2. Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division submitted on dtd. 16.01.2018 and 30.01.2018 that B-80 is taken as per meter reading, but has not mentioned in clear terms that reading of old meter is taken from Permanent Disconnection report (Page 54). Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division submitted CPL, PD report of old meter No. 478926 on 15.02.18. Old meters photo reading are not produced, also. CPL shows meter is PD during May 2017 (last bill of meter No. 478926 is up to April 2017), but PD report discloses PD date as 02.06.2017. Also Signature of consumer is not taken on PD report & photo of meter reading is not available also PD report is officially not outward from Section Office.

PD report remark discloses “said meter was in Aurangpura Unit & bill is from City Chowk “

All these facts shows PD report is prepared after long time after disconnection, not signed by consumer and officially not outward from Section Office, hence doubtful and not acceptable.
 3. CPL for month April 2016, November 2016 to January 2017 shows normal consumption, if meter Sr. No. of CPL and actual meter on site not matches how these bills are prepared with normal status.

4. CPL for month February 2017 to April 2017, which shows meter faulty Status , whether old meter was actual faulty for this period.
5. Additional Executive Engineer submitted on dtd. 06.03.2018 that photos of old meter No. 478926 are not clear. Also not mentioned about availability of old meter to verify reading. Spot inspection report of new meter No 40714877 (Page No. 61) reading on 16.02.2018 is 1474 KWH and meter reconnected on 18.09.2017, hence monthly consumption 268 units apply is very much higher than proposed 27 units/month. This large difference in consumption trend is not justified.
6. B-80 for previous period up to April 2017 is considered for old meter but after reconnection on dtd 02.09.2017 bills are not revised as per new meter reading.

Hence proposed B-80 of consumer No. 490018435435 in the month of December 2017 i.e. Rs. 9,160/-revised to Rs. 2,120/- is not acceptable.

15) Additional Executive Engineer on dtd. 06.03.2018 submitted report that, consumer's old meter photos are not clear / readable and hence bill cannot be revise as per reading of old meter No 478926. He changed his stand from previous proposed B-80 and said that bill can be revise considering base of new meters monthly consumption 268 units and revised proposed bill for November 2015 to April 2017 will be Rs 29,890/- (Rs. 21,190/- will increase in original bill) and submitted bill of January 1208 as Rs 31190/-

16) This proposed revised B-80 has following Discrepancies.

1. Additional Executive Engineer suddenly changed his stand that previous old meter's photo of reading are not available while in his statement on 27.02.2018 was B-80 was proposed considering bills issued for period November 2015 to April 2017 for above consumer are

- wrong not as per reading and bill is revised as per final reading showing 399 KWH on permanent disconnection report of old meter, submitted by Assistant Engineer(page 54)
2. New meter No 40714877 is not tested / accuchek to verify whether new meters consumption is as per connected load, as per directions of CGRF. On dtd. 20.02.2018, as very large rise in consumption trend.
 3. Additional Executive Engineer not justified such large variation in proposed B-80 consumption trend.
 4. Additional Executive Engineer has not clarified Why previous old meter photo / meter reading not available, previously stated that bill is revised as per reading.
 5. Instead of pointing out clear facts and answers of query raised by CGRF he was absent during last two hearing and also not submitted in writing, it shows casual approach, hence there is doubt regarding truth.

Proposed revised B-80 bill of consumer No. 490018435435 for November 2015 to April 2017 there is Rs. 21,190/- will increase in original bill and submitted bill up to Jan18 as Rs 31,190/- is not acceptable.

17) Also new connection is released to consumer No. 490018435427 on 01.12.2015 for Commercial purpose. Consumer raised dispute for bills up to September 2017 saying these are wrong. He submitted bill copy of November 17 showing arrears as Rs.19150/- and challenge it. Bill for month Sept. 2017 shows last payment on Dt.10.08.2017 Rs. 1,1220/-

18) From observation of CPL .it is clear that connection is released with meter No 01105552. Permanent disconnection report (Page No. 70) shows meter No. 4789266 was removed of above consumer on dtd. 02.06.2017. These facts reveal that Consumer was billed with wrong meter up to April 2017, consumer was PD

for May 2017 to August 2017 (PD as per CPL). On dtd. 18.09.2017 consumer is reconnected (PD to live) with meter No. 40714870 (Page No. 57) but again Bills issued on average basis. Hence, bills up November 2017 are incorrect and not acceptable hence require to revise.

19) Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division has submitted proposed B-80 on 16.01.2018 ,stating that bills issued during May 2016 to April 2017 for consumer No. 490018435427 are wrong and not as per reading. Now as per consumer application and Assistant Engineer Report bill is revised from May 2016 to April 2017. Bill amount of Rs. 16,102.90 is deducted from current bill. On dtd. 30.01.2018, he submitted proposed revised bill for the month of December 2017 i.e. Rs. 19,180/- is revised to Rs. 3,080/-. He has submitted that bill revision is proposed as per meter reading. Additional Executive Engineer Shahaganj Sub Division has submitted CPL and justification of B-80 on 15.02.2018 and again stated that bills issued for period May 2016 to April 17 for above consumer are wrong and not as per reading. Bill is revised as per final reading showing 939 KWH on permanent disconnection report submitted by Assistant Engineer(Page No. 53), i.e. 773 KWH to 939 KWH = 166 KWH units for 12 months i.e. 14 units per month consumption.

Meter No. shown on CPL and permanent disconnection report are different. Meter No. given by AE is correct and meter No. on CPL is wrong

20) Proposed B-80 in the month of December 2017 i.e. Rs.1 9,180/-revised to Rs. 3,080/-has following discrepancies.

1. Additional Executive Engineer Shahaganj Sub Division stated on dtd 02.01.2018 that bills issued during May 2016 to April 2017 for consumer No. 490018435427 are wrong and not as per reading. Now as per consumer application and Assistant Engineer Report bill is

revised from May 2016 to April 2017 and provisional bills are issued. Also stated that as per interim order of CGRF consumer paid above bills and reconnection charges , hence supply is reconnected, but fact is that CGRF passed interim order as “Keeping dispute amount aside & restore the supply after payment of all monthly current bills. Electricity supply shall be continued up to decision of Forum.” CGRF never passed interim order for specific bill revision. Additional Executive Engineer produced irresponsible and incorrect statement.

2. Additional Executive Engineer Shahaganj Sub Division submitted on dt. 16.01.2018 and 30.01.2018 that B-80 is taken as per meter reading, but not mentioned clear that reading of old meter is taken from Permanent Disconnection report (Page No. 54) or photo of old meter. Additional Executive Engineer, Shahaganj Sub Division has submitted CPL, PD report of old meter No 4789266 (page 53) on 15.02.18. Old meters photo reading are not produced, also CPL shows meter is PD during May 2017 (last bill OF meter No 478926 is up to April 17), but PD report discloses PD date as 02.06.2017. Also Signature of consumer is not taken on PD report & photo of meter reading is not available also PD report is officially not outward from Section Office.

PD report remark discloses “said meter was in Aurangpura Unit & bill is from City Chowk “

All these facts shows PD report is prepared after long time from disconnection, not signed by consumer and officially not outward from Section Office. Hence doubtful and not acceptable.

3. CPL for month April 2016 shows normal consumption, if meter Sr. No. of CPL and actual meter on site not matches how this bill is prepared with normal status.
4. CPL for month February 2016 to March 2016 and May 2016 to April 2017, which shows meter faulty status.
Status, whether old meter was actual faulty for this period.

5. Additional Executive Engineer submitted on dtd 06.03.2018 that photos of old meter No 01105552 are not clear. Also not mentioned about availability of old meter to verify final reading. Spot inspection report of new meter No 40714877 (Page No. 57) reading on 16.02.2018 is 356 KWH and meter reconnected on 18.09.2017, hence monthly consumption 65 units apply for revised proposed B80 is very much higher than proposed 14 units / month. This large difference in consumption trend is not justified.

6. B-80 for previous period up to April 2017 is considered for old meter but after reconnection on dtd. 18.9.2017 bills are not revised as per new meter reading.

Hence Proposed B-80 for consumer No. 490018435427 in the month of December 2017 i.e. bill of Rs 19,180/- revised to Rs. 3,080/- is not acceptable.

21) Addl EE on Dt. 06.03.2018 submitted report that, consumers photo of old meter are not clear / readable and hence bill cannot be revise as per reading old meter No 4789266. He change his stand from previous proposed B80 and said that bill can be revise considering base of new meters monthly consumption 65 units and revised proposed bill for May 2016 to April 2017. Rs 8301.24/- will deducted in original bill and submitted bill of Jan18 as Rs 12410/-

22) This proposed revised B-80 has following Discrepancies.

1. Additional Executive Engineer suddenly change stand that previous old meter's photo of reading are not available while in his statement on 27.2.18 was B-80 was proposed considering bills issued for period May 2016 to April 17 for above consumer are wrong not as per reading and bill is revised as per final reading showing 939 KWH on permanent disconnection report of old meter ,submitted by Assistant Engineer (Page 54)
2. New meter No 40714870 is not tested / accuchek to verify whether new meters consumption is as per connected load , as per directions of CGRF. On dtd. 20.02.2018, as very large rise in consumption trend considered for revised B-80.
3. Additional Executive Engineer not justified such large variation in proposed B-80 consumption trend.
4. Additional Executive Engineer not clarified why previous old meter photo / meter reading not available, previously stated that bill is revised as per reading.
5. Instead of pointing out clear facts and answers of query raised by CGRF he was absent during last two hearing and also not submitted in writing also, it shows casual approach hence there is doubt regarding truth.

Hence Proposed revised B-80 for for consumer No. 490018435427 for May 2016 to April 2017.i.e. Rs 8301.24/- deducted in original bill and submitted bill upto Jan18 as Rs 12410/-is not acceptable.

23) In this case respondent submitted proposed B-80 bills Dt. 30.01.2018 saying that consumer No 490018435427 has issued bill during May 2016 to April 2017 was not as per reading, and for consumer No 490018435435 has issued bill

during November 2015 to April 2017 was not as per reading. As per consumer application and Assistant Engineer report provisional bills issued &. After interim order of CGRF consumer made payment of said bills and supply is reconnected. Bills are revised as per reading and has produced hand written bill of December 2017 for consumer No 490018435427 of Rs 3080 /- and bill of December 2017 for consumer No 490018435435 of Rs 2120/- of December 2017 along with CPL , PD report and spot inspection report of both these consumers.

24) On date 30.01.2018 both parties arguments are heard and matter is kept for order. On date 06.02.2018 on going through the documents for purpose of delivering order, it is transpired that officer of respondent have given proposed bill of December 2017 for consumer No 490018435427 of Rs 3080 /- and bill of December 2017 for consumer No 490018435435 of Rs 2120/-. How it is calculated is not on record and requires to be called for. On Dt. 15.2.18 MR. Assistant Accountant, Mr. Manoj Kulkarni has submitted B-80 details, spot inspection reports of both consumers and it is taken on record. On Dt. 20.02.2018, respondent representative Additional Executive Engineer, Mr. A. P. Shirole & Assistant Accountant, Mr. Manoj Kulkarni were directed to submit the points i.e. clarification on document filed on 15.02.2018 and query raised by Forum about accuracy of corrected bill. Both parties heard. In order to enlight on the points, the respondent officer submitted that opportunity may given to find out photo of old meter. Hence, time was given to Respondent officer for production of photo of old meter and also directed to examine new meter by accucheck etc. & on submission of such report argument of both sides will be freshly heard. Accordingly arguments are reopened to elicit the truth.

25) Additional Executive Engineer on dtd. 06.03.2018 submitted that Assistant Engineer at that time released supply to consumer No 490018435435 through

meter No 4789263 and consumer No 490018435427 through meter No. 4789266, these facts come to notice from meter issuing register and confirmed from PD reports, Assistant Engineer at that time had made mistake, while feeding online New connection reports. Bills were issued to consumer No 490018435435 as showing meter No. 1104665 and consumer No 490018435427 as showing meter No 1105552, After checking, it is found that, both consumers photo of old meter are not clear and reading not seen. Hence bills cannot be revised as per reading for previous disputed period. He change his stand from previous and stated that previous bill can be revised considering, new meter monthly consumption trend. He Proposed revised B-80 bill of consumer No. 490018435435 for November 2015 to April 2017 there is Rs. 21190/-will increase in original bill and submitted bill up to Jan18 as Rs 31190/-and Proposed revised B-80 for consumer No. 490018435427 for May 2016 to April 2017.i.e. Rs 8,301.24 deducted in original bill and submitted bill up to Jan18 as Rs 12,410/-

We reject both proposed B-80 with earlier mentioned reasons.

26) This Forum has directed respondent to produce photo of old meter, reading of old meter, examine new meter by accucheck etc. but it was not complied.

27) Much ado is made by consumer representative Shri Ali as to once the B-80 is accepted by complainant, how the case is reopened. It is important to note that this Forum is in duty bound to verify & elicit the truth. So, in this case the proposed B-80 as was found blanket, query was raised by this Forum to Respondent. Respondent's Representative has submitted additional documents on 15.02.2018 & time was also granted to Respondent for production of photos of meter & opportunity is given to both parties to submit fresh arguments.

Hence Argument of Consumer Representative Shri Ali about reopening of arguments does not hold water. In order to have just decision of the dispute additional documents can very well be entertained, provided, natural justice be followed, & in this case opportunity is accordingly given to both sides.

28) It is important to note that, considering wrong installation of meter & other circumstances described above, though this Forum has concluded that the disputed bills are required to be revised, but for calculation submitted by Respondent of both B-80 are not justified. So in this back drop, we feel it just & proper to appoint committee of two members who have to check the entire record & then to approve & issue final revised bills of disputed period for both Consumer nos. to the complainant. Such appointment will only meet the ends of justice, so we answer this point accordingly.

29) **Point No. 2 & 3** :- Considering the above discussed circumstances, disconnection of electricity supply of the consumer without issuing notice to him under section 56 of Indian Electricity Act, 2003 is unjustified. On account of mistakes committed by the officers of the Respondent, the complainant was put to harassment & mental agonies & the electricity supply was restored after interim order passed by this Forum. So we feel it proper & just to impose Rs. 1000/- compensation to Respondent & it be recovered from the pocket of erring officer. We accordingly answer point No. 2 & 3 in favour of the complainant.

30) For the aforesaid reasons we proceed to pass following order in reply to point No. 4.

ORDER

The complainant is hereby allowed in the following terms.

- 1) It is hereby ordered to revise the disputed bills of Consumer No. 490018435435 & of Consumer No. 490018435427 from the date of

connection up to April 2017, However, the proposed B-80 are rejected, therefore the revision of bills calculation be made as follows :

The Respondent is directed to appoint committee of two members, out of which one member shall be of higher designation than Additional Executive Engineer & one member from accounts section for revision of bills. The said committee is directed to recheck the complete recorded, photos of meters of the disputed bills for disputed period and then to calculate the revised amount of both the disputed bills & to issue revised bills within one month from the date of receipt of this order to Respondent.

- 2) The Respondent is hereby directed to pay compensation of Rs. 1000/- to the complainant for illegal disconnection of Electricity supply. Such amount be recovered by Respondent from the pocket of erring officer.
- 3) Respondent representative Addl. Executive Engineer & Assistant Accountant of Shahaganj Sub Division, each is fined with Rs. 2000/- for wrong & insufficient submissions made by them. Each officer to deposit fine amount of Rs. 2000/- in the office of the Respondent within one month from the date of receipt of this order. Copy of this order be sent to each of the officer under due acknowledgement.
- 4) Under the circumstances Respondent to pay Rs. 500/- (Rupees Five hundred only) cost of litigation to the complainant.
- 5) Compliance be made within 30 days from the receipt of the order & it be reported to this Forum.

Sd/-
Shobha B. Varma
Chairperson

Sd/-
Laxman M. Kakade
Member / Secretary

Sd/
Vilaschandra S.Kabra
Member