

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
AURANGABAD ZONE, M.S.E.D.C.L., AURANGABAD.

( Case No: CGRF/ AZ / U / 340 / 2011 / 20 )

Date of Filing: 15.07.2011

Date of Decision: 04.08.2011

Shri Mohan Hanumandas Agrawal,  
Plot No. 404, N-1, CIDCO,  
Aurangabad.  
(Consumer No.490010778902)

Consumer Complainant.

V/s

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.

Urban Circle Aurangabad.

The Distribution Licensee.

Coram:

Shri V.B. Mantri President

Shri V.S. Kabra Member

Shri Mohd.Qamaruddin, Member secretary

JUDGEMENT

The consumer has put forth his grievance before this Forum as against the bill for the month of February 2011, for its redressal. The case and grievance of the complainant is brief is that, the complainant is the consumer bearing consumer No. 490010778902. He has paid electricity bill up to June2011. His consumption is as an average for 150 to 200 units per month. His average monthly bill is around Rs.800 to 1000/-. He did not consume additional energy in the month of February 2011. He however received bill for 1443 units for the month of February 2011.

As per his request, his electric meter was replaced on 05.03.2011. He paid Rs.50/- towards testing fees of old meter. On changing of meter, he received bill for the sum of Rs.11,790/- considering meter reading of 248 units as per old meter and meter reading of 31 units as per new meter, amounting of Rs.1444 and arrears for the month of February 2011. The consumer than received bill for the month of April 2011, for 257 units amounting to Rs.1518/- and added past arrears, which came to Rs.13,310/-.

It is the grievance of the consumer that, he made oral and written representation to the respondent for meter testing. His bills were not revised up till now. His grievance was not taken in the account by the concern officers.

The consumer therefore requests this Forum to issue revised bill considering his grievance. Delay payment charges or interest may not be charged.

The grievance of the consumer was registered. The copy of grievance was forwarded to the Nodal Officer (Admn.) and the matter was fixed for hearing on 26.07.2011.

The Nodal Officer has submitted reply to the grievance petition. The reply does not appeared to be para-wise reply. The Nodal Officer was therefore asked to submit para-wise reply on 4.8.2011.

On 4.8.2011, the Nodal Officer has submitted the reply in five lines in ignorance of directions of this Forum to submit para wise reply. The Forum thereby found it difficult to appreciate the contents of complaint and his grievance is correct or not.

The consumer has submitted Xerox copies of bills. These bills if perused, then it shows that, the consumer was received bills for the units in between 112 units to 388 units during March 2010 to January 2011. Another bill issued for the month of May 2011 & June 2011, it shows that, past electricity consumption was shown in between 168 units to 388 units during July 2010 to May 2011 except for the month of February 2011. The bill for the month of February 2011 has been shown to be for 1443 units.

The bill issued for the month of April is for 257 units in which arrears of Rs.11764.46 has been shown and the sum of Rs.13,310 has been shown to be payable amount. On perusal of C.P.L., it is seen that, total consumption of 1443 units has been shown for the month of February 2011. The reply so submitted by the Nodal Officer is silent on all these aspects, but submitted that, bill of 1443 units is of two months. This bill is being bifurcated in two months and revised bill is being issued. It is further submitted that, interest is also being deducted. Copy of revision bill is enclosed to the reply of application. Such reply and revision sheet, and admission of Nodal Officer, regarding bifurcation of bill and deduction of interest on its own accord is the proof of mistakes giving rise to the grievance of consumer. There is no explanation or submission on behalf of the respondent regarding justification of abnormal unit of 1443 consumption for the month February 2011. Simultaneously, one can not assume that there was no additional consumption during the month of February 2011, as is pleaded & submitted by consumer .

Hence considering this peculiar situation, more particularly in absence of any submissions or explanations or particular reply on this aspect on behalf of the Nodal Officer, and in order to strike the balance in between the controversy, and in order to solve the dispute and grievance in most justified & in rational manner, the members of this Forum is uniform in opinion that, the disputed bill be reduced to 50 % of the existing bill. The consumer should bear 50 % of the bill and the respondent should forgo 50 % of the bill. Revised bill be accordingly issued. With these reasons, findings and observations this Forum proceed to pass the following order.

#### **ORDER**

- 1.** The disputed bill issued for the month of February 2011 & March 2011 for 1443 units is hereby set aside and it be substituted by 721 units.
- 2.** Revised bill be issued within a week.
- 3.** The consumer shall make payment of revised bill within a week on receipt of revised bill failing which liable for interest/D.P. charges as per rules.
- 4.** Revised bill shall not charge any interest or D.P.charges.

(V.S.Kabra)  
Member

(Mohd.Qamaruddin)  
Member/Secretary

(V.B.Mantri)  
Chairperson

Case No. 340 / 2011  
Page No. 03/03

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

( Case No. CGRF / AZ /AUR /U / 340 / 2011 / 20 )

Date of Filing: 15.07.2011  
Date of Decision: 04.08.2011

Shri Mohan H.Agrawal,  
Plot No. 404, N-1,  
CIDCO  
Aurangabad.  
(Consumer No. 490010778902)

Consumer Complainant.

V/s

MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION  
COMPANY LTD. URBAN CIRCLE, AURANGABAD.

The Distribution Licensee.

**Coram:**

Shri V.B.Mantri	Chairperson
Shri Mohd.Qamaruddin	Member Secretary
Shri V.S.Kabra	Member

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

The consumer complainant Shri Mohan H.Agrawal,  
Plot No.404, N-1, CIDCO, Aurangabad, has filed this grievance in Annexure  
“A” before this Forum on 15.07.2011 under Regulation No. 6.10 of the  
Regulations 2006. The grievance of the consumer was registered in this office at  
Sr.No. 340/2011/20 and was forwarded to the Nodal Officer, (Adm.) in the office  
of the Superintending Engineer, O&M Urban Circle, Aurangabad and hearing in  
the matter was kept on 26.07.2011.

Case No.340/2011/  
Page No. 01/03

Claim grievance against billing for the month of February 2011 and March 2011.

01) The complainant is the consumer bearing consumer No. 490010778902 in the name of Mohan Hanumandas Agarwal Plot No.404, N-1, CIDCO, Aurangabad . The said connection is for residential purpose. Consumer submitted his grievance for redressal of bill issued by the Distribution Licensees (hereinafter after called as D.L.) for the month of February 2011 and March 2011. The nature of grievance is as follows:-

02) That the consumer has received the bill for the month of February 2011 for amount of Rs. 10,150/- the consume units shown as 1443 units. The consumer received excessive bill as compared to past bills as consumer was regular energy bill payer upto January 2011.The energy bill was paid by him. Hence consumer approach the D.L. for redressal of complaint. In response to complaint D.L. replaced Old meter bearing No. 0314461 by new meter bearing No. 15273048. The consumer paid testing charges vide MR No. 2545873 dated 18.03.2011 Rs.50/- However the D.L. has neither tested meter nor revise the bill issued in the month of February 2011, evenafter follow-up by the consumer. The consumer requested Forum to decide the excessive bill till then supply may not be disconnected.

03) Notice was served to the Nodal Officer submitted reply on dated 26.07.2011 but reply does not contain parawise reply. The Nodal Officer appeared on 04.08.2011 with a reply that the consumer was billed for 1443 units in the month of Feb.2011 is bifurcated in five months i.e. from November 2010 to February 2011. The Forum asked Nodal Officer about testing of the consumer replaced meter but Nodal Officer replied orally that the meter was not tested and meter is now not available with him. Hence unable to test the replaced meter.

04) This Forum heard submission of the consumer and Nodal Officer during submission consumer's submitted that the meter recorded consumption in the month of February 2011 is excessive compared to previous recorded consumption and after March 2011 recorded consumption.

05) This Forum persuade the CPL of the consumer. It is found that the recorded consumptions in the month of November 2010, December,2010 & January 2011 and after replacement of meter in the month of March 2011 the recorded consumption for the month of April 2011 May 2011 and June 2011 and an average consumption is 250 to 300 units.

06) From the above it is clear that the recorded consumption in the month of February 2011 is abnormal and in absence of testing report could be helpful for deciding the meter condition. Hence this Forum proceed to pass following order.

Case No.340/2011

Page No. 02/03

**ORDER**

- 01) The Distribution Licensees revise the bill for the month of February 2011 and March 2011 by considering consumptions for the month to the tune 250 units per month and the rest of the bill raised is quashed.
- 02) For the period February 2011 till this date no interest and DPC should be charged.
- 03) Issue the revise bill February 2011 to up-to-date.

( V.S. Kabra)  
Member

( Mohd. Qamaruddin)  
Member/Secretary

( V.B. Mantri )  
Chairperson

Case No.340/2011  
Page No. 03/03