

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM ,  
AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD

Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U /330/ 2011/10

Date of Filing: 11.03.2011

Date of Decision: 09.05.2011

Shri Liladhar Dayaram Parmar,  
Plot No.48. Pannalalnagar,  
Aurangabad.  
(Consumer No. 490010253389 )

Consumer Complainant.

V/s

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.  
Urban Circle, Aurangabad.

Coram:	Shri V.B.Mantri	President
	Shri V.S.Kabra	Member
	Shri P.A.Sagane	Member secretary

Sub: Grievance under the Maharashtra Electricity  
Regulatory Commission, (Consumer Grievance  
Redressal Forum and Ombudsman) Regulations  
2006.

The consumer has filed his grievance in Annexure "A"  
before this Forum on 11.03.2011 under Regulation No. 6.10 of the  
Regulations referred to above. A copy of the grievance was forwarded on  
14.03.2011 to the Nodal Officer and Executive Engineer (Adm) in the  
office of the Superintending Engineer, Urban Circle, 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 29.03.2011

Case No. 330/ 2011

Page No. 01/04

The grievance of the consumer, is as stated below :-

The consumer had taken single phase Residential electricity supply from the M.S.E.D.C.L., Distribution Licensee (hereinafter referred to as D.L.) for his house situated at Plot No.48, vide consumer No. 490010253389, Pannalal Nagar, Aurangabad, come under Kranti Chowk Sub-Division, MSEDCL, Aurangabad. The complainants complaint is about excess billing charged by D.L. for the units 2720. in the bill of January 2011.

Complainant prayer is to set aside excess billing of 2720 units and issue revised correct energy bill. Complainant also demands Rs.500/- for mental agony and compensation.

In short, for above grievance complainant gave detail written complaint to the Chief Engineer (Comm.) and acknowledged by Dy. Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, Kranti Chowk, Aurangabad dated 31.01.2011, in that complaint complainant states that he was shocked when he was received bill of Rs.24,960/- for January 2011. Complainant also states that his meter was changed in the month of September 2009 and from that date he was received average monthly energy bill for 169 units per month till December 2010. i.e. for 16 months complainant received average bill and same was paid in time to time.

The details summary of payment is as given below:-

Sr.No.	Month	Consumption in Units	Amount of Bill Rs.	Payment receipt No.
01	September 2009	169	660	8160100
02	October 2009	169	750	8231887
03	November 2009	169	690	8314942
04	December 2009	169	800	8372317
05	January 2010	169	870	0028270
06	February 2010	169	80	0098783
07	March 2010	169	840	9262276
08	April 2010	169	860	9313722
09	May 2010	169	720	9409708
10	June 2010	169	780	9460670
11	July 2010	169	830	9531927
12	August 2010	169	850	0981388
13	September 2010	169	860	1038705
14	October 2010	169	850	1143073
15	November 2010	169	870	1216727
16	December 2010	169	860	1289287
	TOTAL :-	2704 Units	12,890/-	

On the other hand, Opponent states & submitted that, as per Junior Engineer (Inspection / meter was replaced) Nodal Officer states that, on dated 27.12.2010 old meter of consumer replaced and as per final reading shown by JE i.e. 029356 units bill charged to consumer on average basis by charging 169 units for 16 months and credited bill for Rs.11,440=75 in the month of January 2011. Trend of consumption of new meter is also on higher side.

At the time of hearing Nodal Officer of D.L. could not explain about the difference of old meter reading and new meter replacement new reading i.e. old meter reading is 26636 and new meter reading after replacement is showing 29356. This Forum called original meter replacement register from D.L. which shows that the meter No.60352 is replaced on dated 24.09.2009 and final reading was 26690.

We perused that there is difference in both the documents i.e. meter replacement report and meter replacement original register of the concerned Jr.Engineer. JE states that final reading on register is correct but he could not explained about meter replacement report & there was no sign of consumer on meter replacement i.e. report.

We find that, all the original documents on record, CPL (Consumer personal ledger) & meter replacement report. The CPL shows that adjustment units entry in January 2011 i.e. 2720 units and under that consumption entry shows 6352 units and as per current reading status shows in CPL are 3633 units. So there is difference between consumption of units 6352 and current reading 3633. That difference comes to 2720 units and about this difference there is no reply or explanation from D.L.

Meter replacement report submitted by opponent D.L. on dated 27/December 2010 is not signed by consumer and final reading shows that 0029356 units and current reading shows in January 2011 is 3633 units and total consumption shows that in CPL is 6352 units and difference of both is 2720 units.

In our finding, it is prove that the complainants complaint and grievance for excess billing 2720 unit is correct.

Case No. 330/ 2011  
Page No. 03/04

So Forum come to conclusion that, 2720 units are excess is correct. Hence, we direct the D.L. to quashed or set aside 2720 units and issue revised bill to the complainant. Forum also direct that if any DPC and interest charged to the complainant that will also be withdrawn

Hence this Forum pass the following order.

**ORDER**

- 1) The consumer's grievance is allowed
- 2) Billing of 2720 units is hereby quashed.
- 3) DPC & interest if any leveled on 2720 units be withdrawn.
- 4) Revised bill be issued to complainant accordingly.
- 5) Compliance of this order within 30 days and report to the Forum.

**( V.S Kabra )**  
**Member**

**(P.A. Sagane)**  
**Member/Secretary**

**(V.B.Mantri)**  
**Chairperson**

Case No. 330/ 2011  
Page No. 04/04