

A Govt. of Maharashtra Undertaking)
CIN : U40109MH2005SGC153645

PHONE NO. : 25664314/25664316
FAX NO. 26470953
Email: cgrfbhandupz@mahadiscom.in
Website: 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. 92/2016

Hearing Dt. 19/10/2016

In the matter of excessive bill issued by MSEDCL in month of May 2016

Mrs. Meena Prakash Deshmukh

- Applicant

Vs.

M.S.E.D.C.L., Lokamanyanagar, 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.
- 3) Dr. Smt. Sabnis, Member, CGRF, Bhandup.

B - On behalf of Applicant

- 1) Shri. Suraj Chokrabourty - Consumer Representative

C - On behalf of Respondent No. 1

- 1) Sri. Jitendra R. Prajapon Addl. Executive Engineer, Lokmanynagar Sub Division

Consumer No.0000115575200 billing unit- 4591 Sanction Load 12 KW Connected Load – 12KW Category LT II commercial 3 phase 20KW Date of Connection 20.06.2000

Above named consumer filed this complaint against respondent utility alleging that the said supply used by the consumer for running Hotel business. On date 14.06.2016 the grievance was raised initially before IGRC but no hearing was coming within the period

of 60 days. Consumer received bill for amounting Rs. 1, 84438.74/- in the month of June 2015. According to consumer the said bill is more than average consumption therefore the grievance is raised. Consumer requested considering the previous consumption used by the consumer should be access and exorbitant bill issued in the month of June 2015 is wrong and illegal. Consumer also suspected that there is logical problem in the meter and therefore he requested followed the commercial circular No. 254 rectify the energy bill as per direction 15.4 Regulation of Supply Code and revised the excessive bill. Consumer relied on and filed document of electricity bill, request application for replace of meter and pray for calculation of average consumption considering previous consumption used by the consumer and follow Circular No. 254.

Earlier dispute is filed No.255 before IGRC on 14.10.2016 as hearing was not commence given the period of 60 days consumer approach to this Forum and filed this dispute in schedule 'A' on 24.08.2016.

After filing the said dispute notice was issued to respondent utility. After service of notice respondent utility appeared filed reply on 05.10.2016. Respondent utility submitted that test of the meter of NABI National appellate Board of testing and calibration laboratory. The meter testing charges for hole current of 3 phase meter is 9500/- which is to be borne by applicant. Therefore NABI does not check the disputed meter but the authority by Executive Engineer, Wagle estate and Executive Engineer testing division the meter may be check in the lab. As per record available to the respondent utility progressive reading record of the available and respondent utility authority come to conclusion that as per explanation the allegation made by M/s Sanskruti Hotel consumption recorded properly and during the test of meter the meter was found 'OK'. Respondent utility submitted that MRI for the period of six not available. The record is available only for 45 days which is filed on record. Respondent utility also submitted that event shown in the record due to voltage fluctuation and

current imbalance is available with the reading and the load at that time. The record of month wise event corresponding to load reading is available on verification of this record according to utility the meter was not jump and was not recorded unit abruptly. The record is as per energy consumed by the consumer and recorded on the meter. Therefore the unit charge against the consumer 13874 and bill is claim Rs 1,84,440/-is legal valid and proper. There is no substance allegation made by consumer and therefore consumer is liable to pay the said bill as it is legal valid and proper. Respondent utility prayed for rejection of complaint with cost.

After perusing the contention and objection raised by the consumer and after hearing & the reply of utility following point arose to our consideration. To which I have recorded our finding to the point for the reason below.

1. Whether bill issued by respondent utility in May 2016 is legal, valid and proper.
2. Whether meter is OK and no fault.
3. What relief and order?

Reasons

I have given opportunity to the consumer and his representative and who appeared before this Forum on various dated. The grievance and allegation made by consumer is heard by this Forum. It appears that the bill issued in month of May 2016 calculated the unit 13874 in month in May 2016 is legal valid and proper. The procedure in case of accumulated bill claim by respondent utility in single month it is obvious the consumer feeling aggravated by the said bill raised objection initially before IGRC. But unfortunately it appears that IGRC authority does not care to consider the dispute within reasonable time and resulted dissatisfaction of consumer and normally it is found they rush approach before the Forum to seek relief.

I have considered the status of consumer and bill disputed issued in the month of May 2016. The connecting load under the category of LT II commercial 3 phase CL- 20KW. The unit consumption record on the said meter was verified the respondent utility categorical submitted that the meter testing charges up to heavy and consumer was not ready to deposit huge amount of 9500/- for testing of meter by laboratory testing authority authorized. However, the record available of 45 days submitted by respondent utility from Feb. 2016 to Sep. 2016. The MRI data is relied and produced before this Forum. We have verified the said data technically and tried to find out whether the meter is faulty at any level. The allegation made by consumer following commercial Circular No. 254 which is in event of average and excessive billing guideline issued. The said consumer not produced any record nor satisfactory explain that there is earlier event of jumping of the said meter. This Forum examine the technical aspect of chance of faulty meter status event at any earlier time and unfortunately the result is negative and therefore the benefit of Regulation No. 15.4.3. in case of faulty meter status the average consumption of bill benefit cannot be given to consumer. It appears to be that the actual unit used by the consumer and as consistently the data of MRI indicate that the connecting load was consistently within the normal range there is no event on technical issue found ever the meter was jumped. Therefore I found the allegation is not correct made by the consumer about incidence of meter are jumped. However the for opportunity was given by this Forum and waited for longer time. According to consumer the average consumption was 70-80 per month and it was raised to 185 units. However MRI report produce by respondent utility for 45 days indicate that there is no technical fault nor the event of jumping of meter found and therefore 185 units consumption recorded on the meter is not faulty. Therefore I found no substance in the allegation made by the consumer. However in the fair interest the liability of payment of huge bill in one month is not possible. The record produce by the consumer he already deposited Rs. 1,00,000/- against the said bill of 1,84,000/- to prevent threat of disconnection. The said amount

is deposited on 21.07.2016 remaining amount of Rs.84000/- yet to be recovered by the utility. I am inclined to give benefit of payment of dues remaining amount in six monthly installments without charging any interest and penalty. However, grievance made by the consumer stands dismiss. I proceed to pass following order.

ORDER

1. The consumer complaint No. 92/2016 stands dismiss no cost.
2. The respondent utility authorized to recover to remaining bill without charging any interest and penalty in six monthly installment along with current bill.

Proceeding close.

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

Note:

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**

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

I Agree/Disagree

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

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

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

