

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. 662/2015**

**Hearing Dt. 09/08/2016**

**In the matter non compliance of SOP directive supply new connection within 30 days and against fulfilling administrative requirement illegal enforce by utility**

**M/s. Natu Electrical**

- Applicant

Vs.

**M.S.E.D.C.L., Gadkari Sub Division.**

- Respondent

**Present during the hearing**

**A - On behalf of CGRF, Bhandup**

- 1) Shri. Anil Bavthankar, Chairman, CGRF, Bhandup
- 2) Shri.Ravindra S. Avhad, Member Secretary, CGRF, Bhandup.

**B - On behalf of Applicant**

Shri. Milind M .Natu – Consumer/Consumer representative

**C - On behalf of Respondent**

Shri. Kore, Addl. Executive Engineer, Gadkri Sub Division.

### **ORDER**

Above named complainant filed this complaint against the respondent utility stating that he apply for new connection to his premises and fulfil and submitted all required forms and fill on 24.02.2016 till the date duly complied all the directive on 23.07.2015 and deposited testing fee of meter on date 24.02.2016. The respondent utility not acted upon to giving supply of new connection. It is also alleged by consumer the respondent utility enters in to correspondence letters no 949 dtd. 24.02.2016. Consumer raised the dispute but utility only prolong the matter and abnormal delay

caused for release of new connection. It is further alleged by respondent utility not communicated to the consumer about requirement and insisted consumer to deposit Rs. 200/- Stamp paper and demanded unnecessary document along with A1 form the Annexure 'V'. Consumer raised dispute as per SOP direction the limit cross providing of new connection is 30 days. In spite of that Additional Executive Engineer of respondent utility division contravened the said provision. Therefore consumer pray for giving direction to utility for immediate supply connection and also take suitable action against erring officer and give necessary direction to the officer of respondent utility .

Initially the consumer approach to the IGRC cell and filed his grievance in Forum No. 'X' on dated 05.01.2016. Consumer raised the general grievance against respondent utility .IGRC cell registered complaint on information submitted by the consumer. Thereafter notice was given to the consumer for hearing internal grievance forum also issued notice to the respondent utility for giving para wise reply to the said complaint. Thereafter internal grievance Forum upon hearing of both parties gave opportunity and decided the said dispute. Respondent utility filed parawise reply to the IGRC cell on complaint raised by consumer as per rules and regulation guideline of process required regarding application of change of name and new service connection issued by office vide letter no SE/TUC/TS No 3568 Dated 23.07.2015 & 0949 dated 24.2.2016 to consumer. It was inform by IGRC on 19.07.2014 raising dispute about other consumer number Smt.Sharada Gosavi and M/s. Krishna Corporation on dated 09.06.2016 IGRC decided the dispute mentioning on 19.04.2014 order communicated to the consumer as per guidelines the procedure followed in view of office letter 23.07.2015 by TUC thane and Bhandup all sub division office followed under the rule of Thane Urban Circle inform this guidelines there is also guideline regarding letter testing fee and change of name required amended format as per direction of MERC SOP 2014 direction already given by IGRC to follow MERC direction & implementation of quarry and inform this decision to the consumer.

Being dissatisfied with said direction consumer approach to the Forum and raised dispute about non-performance of SOP within 30 days limit for installation of new

connection consumer pray that direction to stop the practice of receiving affidavit and Rs. 200 stamp paper for new connection should be stop & direction of administrative Circular to be given to the respondent utility. After filing the said dispute under Schedule Form 'A' this consumer of register case on no. 662 and issuing notice respondent utility on 11.03.2016. Thereafter service of notice respondent utility appeared & filed reply on 09.08.2016 .It is contention of consumer M/s. Natu Electrical is a contractor and he filed grievance is the capacity of contractor as mention in Schedule from 'A'. According to utility the grievance raised by M/s. Natu Electrical not within the per view of jurisdiction of M/s Natu Electrical as he doesn't come under the category of consumer and nature of dispute raised by the consumer is not grievance as per the definition of CGRF Regulation .The allegation made by the consumer is administrative decision of superintending Engineer to streamline the general working of CCFC.such kind of complaint are not maintainable and not entertain by CGRF. Even compliant made for IGRC cell in Schedule 'X' and CGRF schedule 'A' form filed as a contractor against the respondent utility & consumer pertaining to Gadkari & Power House sub division .The consumer not failed any case to IGRC and CGRF.The case already decided by IGRC cell properly. Hence this consumer complaint without merit liable to be dismiss.

After perusing the all relevant documents, following points arose for our consideration.

1. Whether respondent utility violated provisions of SOP & exceeding limit willfully and intentionally and not gave supply new connection within 30 days.
2. Whether complied filed by this consumer dispute about other consumer in this complaint mentionable.
3. Whether respondent utility required necessary and administrative direction by this Forum.

### **Reasons**

On Various date I gave opportunity for hearing to the consumer representative of M/s. Natu Electrical and also representative respondent utility. The respondent utility officer

appear with correspondence letter by additional Executive Engineer to Nodal officer dated 05.02.2016 copy of IGRC decision details of requirement procedure required of change of name and letter dated 26.11.2015 minutely, perused by me. This consumer raised dispute against the respondent utility challenging administrative decision of Superintending Engineer. The dispute is not only restricted to violation of SOP 30 days limit required for new connection. But also challenge general administrative requirement himself along with other consumer also . Upon considering the nature of grievance, it is certainly not a billing dispute consumer cannot raise the dispute of other consumer in his complaint. Therefore this Forum cannot considered the dispute of other consumer raised by representative as it is not within the procedure those consumer neither approach to IGRC nor filed any complaint in form No. 'A' before this Forum. Hence submission and allegation made by this consumer about the grievance of other consumer not entertain stands dismiss.

So far as the dispute raised by this consumer of requirement of direction to the respondent utility. It is pertaining to note that Commercial circular 255 dtd. 07.12.2015 already issued by Authorized Officer of respondent utility available on web site. The requirement from attaching the document and the required document also not to the attachment to with 200 Rs. Stamp as per Government resolution No1614/345/71/18A dtd. 09.03.2016. The government Circular under General Administration and Circular of Commercial 255 dated 07.12.2015 is binding on respondent utility. Continuous practice of unnecessary demanding voluminous document to the view of this Forum should be cartels. Respondent utility at liberty to pick proper guidance from where authority and should followed the Circular Government GR scrupulously. In case of failure who observe suitable action can be initiated against erring officer. Certainly, the compliant other administrative direction can be entertain by proper forum of respondent utility service condition rules against the erring Officer copy of this order can be place before concern officer for compliance.

It appears that violation of 30 days limits apply for new connection start only after completion of procedure. Respondent utility pointed out the consumer was not found

on the address when attempt was made for compliance of document amended SOP regulation 2014 filed required for new connection within reasonable period with apply only after fulfilling require condition and following proper procedure by the consumer. Merely, applying for new connection date such grievance of non complaint cannot be raised by consumer before this Forum as respondent utility properly objected the jurisdiction. During the grievance falls in the category of billing dispute non observation of SOP is not within the preview of this Forum to decide. Hence grievance is liable to dismiss with cost. Hence order.

### **ORDER**

1. The consumer complaint 662/2016 dismiss with cost.

No order is to the cost.

Proceedings closed.

Note:

1) If Consumer is not satisfied with the decision, he may file representative 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.

**I Agree/Disagree**

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

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

