

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AURANGABAD ZONE, AURANGABAD.

Case No. CGRF /AZ/R/487/2014/08

Date of Admission 22/01/2014

Date of Decision 02/04/2014

1. Shri. Vishnukanth Sitaram Maniyar COMPLAINANT.
Plot No.1.18, Sevan Hill 323751,
Jalna Road,
AURANGABAD.

VERSUS.

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

CORAM:

Shri S.K.Narwade Member/Secretary

Shri V.S.Kabra Member.

REDRESSAL - DECISION

The complainant is consumer of respondent MSEDCL and GTL bearing consumer No.490012174699. He is using electricity supply for commercial purpose billed under LT-2 B category. The complaint is regarding excess billing and faulty readings taken by respondents. The respondent replaced old meter being it was fast, faulty and jumping. The complainant submitted in his complaint that, the contract demand is 35 KVA; however using very less i.e. up to 17.5 KVA. The complainant also submitted there is big difference in consumption of old meter and new

meter replaced. The bills issued by the respondent for the month of July-2012 are of 42,669 units and September-2012 is of 2582 units. The new meter shows daily consumption around 60/ 65 units per day on average basis. The respondent GTL issued bill for part payment of Rs.80,000/- and it is paid by the complainant. The complainant therefore, prayed that, to issue correct bill, withdraw D.P.C. and Interest and to provide copy of CPL and meter testing report.

The respondent GTL submitted in the reply that, the electricity load availed by consumer is 38 kw and not 37 kw. The electricity meter of the said consumer was changed in November-2012. Subsequent to the meter change, only for two months viz. January-2013 and February-2013, the consumption was recorded less than 1000 otherwise for the period past and prior to meter change, the average consumption of this consumer is about and above 3000 units per month.

Regarding reduction in contract demand, the respondent has not received any request for reduction in contract demand.

Moreover, in the month of July-2012 the consumer was issued bill of 3797 units and not 42699 units as mentioned by complainant. The copy of CPL is submitted before forum.

On the request of the consumer, the meter was tested on 13/2/2013 where in meter of the consumer was found OK in accuracy. The bills are provided as per consumption and reading. Therefore, complaint of the consumer may kindly be rejected.

The complainant argued during hearing to test the meter in NABL Lab (Rural Testing Division, MSEDCL, Aurangabad) and testing charges are to be paid by respondent GTL since complainant has paid the charges to GTL. Accordingly respondent GTL has paid testing charges of Rs.11,236/- to the Meter Testing Lab, Aurangabad. The copy of the receipt for Meter Testing charges is submitted before forum. The meter is tested in NABL MSEDCL Lab on 26.03.2014 and the meter is found as OK. The respondent argued that, meter testing charges paid by GTL need to be

debited to the Consumer since the meter is found O.K.in accordance with the Clause 14.4.2 and 14.4.4 of the MERC (Electricity Supply Code and Other Conditions of Supply) Regulations, 2005 will be applicable to the Complainant and Respondents in the matter. The copy of the said Regulations is placed on record.

The forum heard both complainant and respondent. The forum pursued with the CPL the bill issued by respondent in the month of July 2012 is of only 3797 units and for 42699 units as complained by petitioner. The CPL also shows the power factor incentive is given and credited into consumers account for the period of Sep2011 to Oct2012.Since Nov2012 onwards power factor penalty is charged up to Nov2013 and incentive is given for Dec2013 and Jan2014. The forum seen the meter testing report and found meter is O.K. The complainant is not satisfied with meter testing report since he was not present at the time of testing and demanded third party testing of old meter which was replaced in Dec2013.The forum directed respondent to test the previous meter in MSEDCL Lab and respondent to bear the testing charges. Accordingly meter sr. no.G0000271 is tested in MSEDCL Lab and the meter is found O.K. as per report. The forum also pursued with MRI data of old and new meter, it is observed by forum that the power factor for Nov 2013 and prior to Nov 2013 is very less i.e. 0.51 to 0.56 hence penalty is charged thereby increasing in bills. The complainant is in the assumption of fault in meter, which is not a fact however the bill amount is increased due to penalty charged due to less P.F. The complainant has to maintain the power factor 0.9. Therefore forum is in the opinion that, the meter testing charges paid by respondent GTL, for third party Testing of meter to be paid by complainant as per MERC regulation 14.4.2 and 14.4.4 being meter is O.K. Considering the aspects as in above, forum issues following order.

ORDER

The complaint is dismissed with no cost.

Third party meter testing charges paid by respondent GTL to be debited in to complainant account

(S.K.Narwade.)
Chairperson &
Member/Secretary

(V.S. Kabra.)
Member

