

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

**Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/33/ 2007/ 02**

**Date of Filing: 02.02.07**

**Date of Decision: 05.03.07**

**Shri - R.P. Dhaneshwar  
Con.No.(490010075804)**

**The Consumer  
Complainant.**

**Eknathnagar , Aurangabad.**

**V/s**

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

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

1. The consumer has filed his grievance in Annexure “ A “ before this Forum on **2.2.07** under regulation No. 6.10 of the Regulations referred to above. A copy of the grievance was forwarded on 3.2.07 to the Nodal officer and Executive Engineer (Adm) in the office of the Superintending Engineer, Urban 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 **20.02.07**
2. The grievance of the consumer, in brief, as per consumer, is as stated below.

The consumer is having electricity meter for his residential use. His meter was replaced in the month of Feb.2003 and the meter reading of the old meter at the time of replacement was 3145. However he received all further bills till Jan.2006 on average basis showing meter status as MET-CH., which he has paid. He made several representations about this to the concerned authorities of the Distribution Licensee, but in vain. From Feb.2006 he has not received any bills .On his complaint, his meter was inspected by the representative of the D.L. and it was assured to him that the bill as per meter reading will be issued to him. He did not receive any bills thereafter till August.06. He thereafter received bills of Rs.5950/ for the period Aug-Sept.06, Rs.6178/ for Sept-

Oct.06 and Rs.6830/ for Oct-Nov.06. On receiving the bills he made complaint to the concerned D.L. officers, but no heed was taken thereof. Since his bills were not revised , he filed his complaint in the Forum and requested the Forum to direct the D.L. to issue his bills as per meter reading after adjusting the payments made by him and also to pay Rs.1000/ towards mental agony and transport charges. The complainant filed relevant documents in support of his complaint..

Cont:

“2”

1. On 20.2.07, consumer was present. The Nodal officer was present. The Nodal officer did not file any response to the grievance till the day of hearing nor at the time of hearing. Nodal officer gave an application for adjournment on the ground that details are not received by him from the concerned sub division. The Forum reluctantly granted the adjournment and next date of hearing was fixed on 26.2.07.
2. On 26.2.07, the consumer was present. The Nodal officer along with Shri Gaikwad, Dy.Ex.Engineer, Chavani sub Division was present. The Nodal officer filed his response along with copies of the CPL. The Nodal officer and Dy.Ex. Engineer gave a revised bill, a copy of which was handed over to the consumer. As requested by the consumer time up to 1.3.07 was granted to file his remarks on the bill handed over to him during the hearing and case was adjourned to 1.3.07.
3. On 1.3.07 , Nodal officer was not present. The consumer was not present and case was reserved for decision.
4. On going through the grievance and documents filed both the parties, we observe that the meter of the consumer was inspected by the representative of the D.L. on 30.06.06. In his report the concerned Jr .Engineer has mentioned that the reading as on 29.06.06 of the new meter was 01752. The Jr.Engineer in his report further stated that the meter was replaced by private contractor and no record thereof is available with unit office and has also recommended to treat last available reading as final. In the remark column he has mentioned that the report is generated to regularize the billing only . On going through the C.P.L. we find that since Feb.2003 to August 2006 the status of meter is shown as “ MT-CHG”, or “Locked,” or “R.N.T”. or “ Faulty” . The meter number shown in the CPL for the period stated above

is 01079500. The previous and current reading shown in the CPL for the entire period from Feb.03 to August 2006 is 3145 and 3145 respectively. That means the initial and current reading is the same for all these months. The bills during these period needless to say , are issued on average basis, ranging between 34-97 units and the same have been paid by the consumer.

5. In the month of Feb.2006 , with the previous & current reading of the old meter ( Sr.No.01079500) was shown as 3145 & 3145 respectively, and average bill for 1292 units appears to have been charged to the consumer.

Cont:

“3”

6. However for the first time in the month of August 2006 the new meter number bearing No.00062790 finds it place in the CPL. AS mentioned above the meter No. mentioned in the CPL continuously from Feb.2003 to July 2006 is 01079500 .In August 2006 the previous & current reading of the new meter is shown as 1466 & 1828 respectively. and bill for 362 units was raised against the consumer.
7. The consumer has contended that old meter was replaced by new meter on 4.2.03 .The Nodal officer in his response has stated that the meter of the consumer was replaced in Dec.2002 with initial reading 0004 . On going through the CPL we find that the status of the meter as MTR-CH is shown for the first time in Feb.2003. Therefore the contention of the Nodal officer about meter having been replaced in Dec.2002 appears to be more convincing and correct. Thereafter, as stated above the meter status in the CPL for the entire period of Feb.03 to July 06 is shown either as MTR-CH, Locked, R.N.A. or Faulty. The previous reading for the month of August 2006 is mentioned as 1466 and current reading as 1828. The previous reading for the month of Sept.06 is shown as 1828 which goes to show that the current reading of 1828 shown for August 06 pertains to new meter only and is correct. Though the current reading for August 06 is correct the previous reading as 1466 for August 06 does not appear to hold any ground of truth. As stated above the previous and current reading for the entire period from Feb.03 to July 06 being the same i.e.3145 . In

view of the position it is difficult to accept the figure of 1466 as previous reading for the month of August 06. The CPL ,does not, in any way explain as to how the figure of 1466 is arrived at . Therefore the previous and current reading from Sept 06 will have to be treated as correct. The reading – previous & current- from Sept.06 to Jan.07 appear to be consistent and there is no anomaly therein. Therefore it would be just and proper to consider the consumption of Electricity by the consumer from installation of new meter till Sept.06 to be 1858 (current reading for Sept.06). In other words it means that the consumer , since installation of new meter till Sept.06 bill has consumed 1858-0004 , i.e. 1854 units.

09. The Dy. Ex. Engineer concerned has revised the bill and furnished the copy thereof along with assessment sheet. On going through assessment sheet we find that the consumption of the electricity only to the extent of 1292 units is only considered while revising the bill without considering the actual consumption as disclosed above i.e. 1854 units between the period from Feb.03 to Sept.06. Therefore the revised bill of which a copy is given to the consumer deserves to be quashed.

Cont:

“4”

10. It is therefore quite clear that the meter was replaced in the month of Dec.2002 only and due to non feeding of meter replacement report all the subsequent bills till August 06 were issued to the consumer with old meter number and showing the meter status either as MET-CH , R.N.A., LOCKED & FAULTY. In spite of the fact though the new meter was installed in Dec.2002 and it was working proper , the D.L. did not care to go to the premises of the

consumer to take readings and instead bills on average basis were issued to the consumer . It is surprising that the complaint of the consumer in this regard was not considered , possibly perhaps due to non feeding of the installation of new meter in the CPL.

It is quite surprising that this phenomenon lasted for a period over three years which we would go to show the callousness of the concerned officers of the D.L. As observed above the consumption of the electricity of the consumer from Dec.2002 to Sept.06 deserves to be considered as 1854 and the bill therefore deserves to be revised in light of this fact. In other words the consumption of 1854 units for this entire period will have to be considered and spread over the entire period uniformly to arrive at proper revised bill. Needless to say the units which the consumer is charged and payments made by him during this period also need to be taken into consideration while preparing the revised bill.

- 11 We are of the opinion that due to utter negligence and considerable delay on the part of the concerned officials of the D.L. in feeding the meter replacement report and in not taking cognizance of the complaint of the consumer in this regard, the consumer, who is a senior citizen has suffered a lot and deserves to be compensated.

### **ORDER**

1. The revised bill for Rs. 2988/ which is given to the consumer and copy of which is filed before the Forum is quashed.
2. The bill of the consumer for period ending Sept.06 shall be revised considering consumption of 1854 units for entire period from Dec.2002 to Sept.2006.While revising the bill the units for which the consumer is already charged should also be taken into consideration. The revised bill should be issued to the consumer within a period of one month from the date of this order. All the payments made by the consumer shall be given necessary setoff.

Cont:

“5”

3. No interest & DPC shall be charged to the consumer while revising the bill.
4. The Distribution Licensee is directed to pay a compensation of Rs.1000/ to the consumer with liberty to adjust the same against the revised bill .
5. The consumer shall pay bill within 21 days from the receipt of same. The consumer is at liberty to pay the revised bill in installments to be granted by the D.L. on application and the D.L. shall be at liberty to charge interest & DPC as per rule.

The Distribution Licensee .& the consumer shall comply with the above order and report compliance to the Forum

**Inform the parties and close the case.**

**(H.A.KAPADIA)**  
MEMBER

**( V.G.JOSHI)**  
MEMBER SECRETARY

**( R.K.PINGLE)**  
CHAIRMAN