

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
AURANGABAD ZONE AURANGABAD

Case No. CGRF/AZ/AUR/U/381/2012/14

Date of Filing	02.03..2012
Date of Decision	05.06.2012

M/s National Foam Industry,
E-15/35, MIDC,
Chikalthana,
Aurangabad.

(Consumer No. 490011452598)

Complainant

V/s

01) The Executive Engineer(Admn.)
Nodal Office, O/O Superintending Engineer,
Urban Circle, M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Aurangabad.

Respondent No.1

02) The Dy.General Manager(Planning),
GTL Ltd. Vithalachi Daya, 1st floor Above YZ Ford Car Showroom,
Cannaught Place, CIDCO,
Aurangabad.

Respondent No.2

CORAM

Shri V.B.Mantri

Chairperson

Shri V.S.Kabra

Member

JUDGEMENT

- 01) The grievance of the complainant is against the electricity bill issued in the month of April 2011.
- 02) The case of the complainant in brief is that, the complainant is the consumer bearing consumer No.490011452588. The complains that, the consumer has received bill of 5035 units in the month of April 2011 which is absolutely wrong. Accordingly to the complainant, the meter was changed in the month of April 2011. The meter reading at the time of change of meter was 65372, but it was taken as 68372 and as such bill of 3000 units has been wrongly issued. The complainant requested repeatedly to the respondents, but the bill was not corrected.

- 03) The second grievance of the consumer is that, the respondent No.2 has wrongly levied PF charges, due to wrong meter reading. The said PF charges are required to be deducted.
- 04) The respondent No.1 MSEDCL has submitted reply and thereby submitted that, meter was replaced in the month of April 2011. The last reading of old meter was 68362. The bill of 64743 was already issued. Hence the bill of balance 3629 units was adjusted and thereby issued in the month of April 2011. The bill in the month of April was thereby issued for 5035 units. As regards PF charges, it relates to respondent No.2 GTL Company.
- 05) The respondent No.2 GTL has submitted reply to the complaint and thereby submitted regarding the second grievance that consumer's PF analysis will be done again to the satisfaction of consumer and in case discrepancy is found then same would be adjusted.
- 06) The respondent No.1 has produced the copy of C.P.L. On going through the C.P.L. it appears that, the consumption of electricity for the month of Jan.2011 Feb.2011, and March 2011 are 3127 units, 2368 units and 1183 units. The consumption of complainant for the months June 2011, July 2011, August 2011, Sept.2011 and Oct.2011 are respectively 2135 units, 2538 units, 2343 units, 2975 units and 2251 units. It is thereby clear that the trend of consumption is in between 1183 units to 3127 units. The consumption was never exceeded 3127 units.
- 07) The respondent No.1 has issued bill for the month of April 2011 for 5035 units. There is no record or justification for these 5035 units.
- 08) It has been submitted by the respondent No.1 that, the meter was replaced in the month of April 2011. The last reading at the time of change of meter was 68362. Accordingly to the complainant, the last reading was 65372 and it was not 68362.
- 09) The respondent No.1 could not produce any evidence to accept that last reading of old meter was 68362. More over it is not explained as to why then the respondent No.1 chosen to accept the last reading to be 64743 for issuing bill in the month of March 2011. The respondent No.1 vide its letter dated 15.05.2012 on the other- hand admits in clear words that, the respondent No.1 has no record available regarding change of meter and meter reading. It is therefore crystal clear that, there is absolutely no basis to accept the case of MSEDCL regarding charging of bills for 3000 units

on the basis of last reading assuming to be 68362. The aforesaid trend of consumption also does not support the case and alleged consumption as stated by MSEDCL. The disputed bill issued in the month of April 2011 for 5035 units as such is not lawful bill. The last reading of old meter should be thereby accepted to be of 65372 instead of 68372. The grievance of the complainant to that effect is required to be accepted and the same should be redressed by directing the respondents to deduct/adjust the bill for such 3000 units.

- 10) As regards the second grievance regarding P.F. charges, it is an admitted fact that, the respondent No.1 was not charging such P.F. charges. As per statement of MSEDCL, the proceeding for deducting P.F. charges would be done by GTL Co. The GTL has stated that, consumer's analysis will be done again to the satisfaction of the consumer. The P.F. charges were levied accordingly to the reading of the meter.
- 11) It is not the case of either of the respondents that of charges were levied correctly. On the other-hand, as per GTL, the charges would be adjusted in case discrepancies are found. It is thus clear that the respondent has illegally levied P.F. charges. The same are required to be either adjusted in future bills or to be refunded..
- 12) The consumer has given details of such P.F. charges. As per such details statement, the GTL has levied P.F.charges at Rs.23,632=34 paisa in all.
- 13) On perusal of CPL, it reveals that, the respondent has charged PF penalty as follows:-

Sr.No.	Month	Amount
01.	May 2011	Rs. 8,096=64 paisa
02.	June 2011	Rs. 5,785=37 paisa
03.	July 2011	Rs. 551=67 paisa
04.	August 2011	Rs. 6,304=19 paisa
05.	Sept.2011	Rs. 1,078=56 paisa
06.	Oct. 2011	Rs. 2,367=58 paisa
	TOTAL	Rs. 23,080=67 paisa

- 14) The complainant has claimed adjustment of PF charges of sRs.23,632=34. The complainant however did not choose to point out that in the month of July 2011 credit of Rs.551=67 was given in P.F. charges. The complainant has claimed Rs.2000/- for harassment, but found not fit to point out credit of Rs.551=67 which was given to the complainant in the month of July 2011. The complainant as such is not entitled for such compensation. The respondents should be however directed to adjust such

amount of Rs.23,080/- in future bills of the complainant which is recovered towards PF penalty as shown above. The second grievance is also as such allowed and the same is redressed by directing GTL to adjust the said amount in future bills. With these reasons and findings, this Forum proceed to redress the complaint of the complainant by passing following order.

ORDER

- 01) The grievance of the complainant/consumer is hereby allowed.
- 02) The grievance is redressed as follows:-
 - a) The respondents shall deduct the bill of 3000/- units from the bill of April 2011.
 - b) The respondents shall give adjustment of Rs.23,080=67 paise in future bills, which was recovered towards P.F.charges during May 2011 to Oct.2011 by the respondents.
- 03) There shall not be any costs or compensation.

Sd/-
(V.S..V.Kabra)
Member

Sd/-
(V.B.Mantri)
Chairperson