

**A Govt. of Maharashtra Undertaking)**

**CIN : U40109MH2005SGC153645**

PHONE NO. : 25664314/25664316

FAX NO. 26470953

Email: [cgrfbhandupz@mahadiscom.in](mailto:cgrfbhandupz@mahadiscom.in)

Website: [www.mahadiscom.in](http://www.mahadiscom.in)

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum

“Vidyut Bhavan”, Gr. Floor,

L.B.S.Marg,Bhandup (W),

Mumbai – 400078.

---

REF.NO. Member Secretary/CGRF/MSEDCL/BNDUZ/

Date

Case No. 621

Hearing Dt. 15.03.2016

**In the matter of billing**

**M/s. Shekhar Glass FIBER Pvt. Ltd.,**

- Applicant

Vs.

**M.S.E.D.C.L., Airoli Sdn.**

- Respondent

Present during the hearing

A - On behalf of CGRF, Bhandup

- 1) Shri. Anil P. Bhavthankar, Chairperson, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 2) Shri.S.B. Bhalshankar, Member Secretary, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 3) Dr. Smt. Sabnis, Member, CGRF, Bhandup.

B - On behalf of Appellant

- 1) Smt.Shruti N. Raut – Consumer Representative
- 2) Shri. P. Chandrashekhar

C – On behalf of Respondent

- 1) Shri. Mahajan, Addl. Executive Engineer, Airoli sub division

**ORDER (18.03.2016)**

1. Above named consumer filed this complaint against respondent utility for receiving excessive and incorrect bills for the period from April 2014 to June 2015. It is stated by the consumer that he obtained electricity

connection vide consumer No. 0000111330450 under 36 LT V category, having meter no 06262407, sanctioned load 67KW and demand load 48KW. The consumer is using the said connection for manufacturing Plastic fiber cable. According to consumer earlier the sanction load and connected load was 7HP, which was enhanced on his application to 50 HP due to his increased requirement. The consumer paid the cost of panel box, cost labour and cable.

2. It is submitted that on 26.05.2014 consumer paid the bill for Rs. 24,759.09/- (for 1909 units). According to consumer this bill was much higher compared to the actual consumption recorded in earlier months. After receiving said bill and demand notice consumer filed dispute before IGRC on 08.05.2014 and also challenged calibration of the meter.
3. On 13.05.2014 calibration was done and new meter was installed.
4. Thereafter the consumer continue to receive exorbitant bills as follows:

Month	Units	Amount (Rs.)
May 2014	4836	60790/-
June 2014	1833	85,140/-
July 2014	1111	97,550/-

5. The consumer has disputed the bills for a period from April 2014 to August 2014 and has claimed refund along with interest.
6. Consumer also has prayed for compensation and refund of legal expenses incurred by him.

7. Accordingly complaint was filed on 06.11.2015 and notice was sent to respondent utility. Respondent utility appeared and filed its reply on 26.02.2016.
8. It is submitted by respondent utility that the meter was replaced in March 2014 (Meter No. 6263407). On 18.07.2014, the meter was tested and investigation was done by MRI data.

After analyzing the reports of meter testing and MRI data, meter was found okay. Respondent utility has filed reports of MRI data and accucheck report.

9. After filing the said complaint, interim order was passed.
10. During the pendency of this litigation all the documents filed by both the parties were studied by us in detail. We also heard the parties.
11. It appears that the dispute which was raised by consumer under the apprehension of in correct exorbitant and excess consumption of unit bill is revised.
12. This Forum gave patient hearing and all the angles of dispute were verified.
13. During pendency of hearing the direction was given to respondent utility to check application of MRI data. Accordingly respondent utility submitted MRI data report. Units generated during the said period indicate that the meter testing report was okay.
14. The allegations of the consumer are found merely on suspicion, as during the period from April 2014 to August 2014 the demand seems to be increasing.

15. It is admitted fact that the sanctioned load was 70KW which was increased by 15 HP on the request of consumer. The record reveals that calibration of meter was done and cable was properly installed. (as is admitted by consumer before IGRC vide complaint No. 004255).
16. It appears that IGRC ought to have decided the complaint within 2 month of filing. But it seems that IGRC, Vashi official are reluctant to decide the complaint filed before IGRC within stipulated time of 2 months.
17. This Forum takes privileged to inform the authority about the conduct of IGRC is officials. They are reluctant and not paying proper attention to the consumer complaints.
18. At no point of time consumer produced any record proving discontinuation of work at the site during the said period (to justify less consumption) and further the graph of consumption after May 2014 is continuously increasing. It is supported by the data of MRI, hence the allegation of charging exorbitant and excess bill is not substantiated.

We found that there in no substance in the allegations made by the consumer in this complaint. The consumer is liable to pay within stipulated time.

19. It is pertinent to note that consumer has already deposited and paid arrears within stipulated time. Therefore there is no question of refund or adjustment in this case.
20. I am bound by report submitted accucheck and MRI data which indicates the meter is correct. Therefore there is no substance in the consumer complaint.

We come to conclusion that the consumer complaint is liable to be dismissed.

## **ORDER**

1) Compliant No. 621/2015 is stands dismiss with no order as to cost.

Proceeding closed.

Both the parties be informed accordingly.

The compliance should be reported within 45 days.

The order is issued under the seal of Consumer Grievance Redressed Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup

Note:

- 1) If Consumer is not satisfied with the decision, it may proceed within 60 days from date of receipt of this order to the Electricity Ombudsman in attached "Form B".

**Address of the Ombudsman**

The Electricity Ombudsman,  
Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,  
606, Keshav Building,  
Bandra - Kurla Complex, Bandra (E),  
Mumbai - 400 051

- 2) If utility is not satisfied with order, it may file representation before the Hon. High Court within 60 days from receipt of the order.

**DR. ARCHANA SABNIS  
MEMBER  
CGRF, BHANDUP**

**RAVINDRA S. AVHAD  
MEMBER SECRETARY  
CGRF, BHANDUP**

**ANIL P. BHAVTHANKAR  
CHAIRPERSON  
CGRF, BHANDUP**