

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.
Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup

Ref. No. Member Secretary/MSEDCL/CGRF/BNDUZ/

Date :

Case No.487

Hearing Dt. 18.03.2013

15.04.13 & 16.07.2013 &
30.07.2013.

In matter of fast meter over restoration of paper supply

Mr. Saurabh G. Sharma

- Applicant

Vs.

M.S.E.D.C.Ltd., Panvel

- Respondent

Present on behalf

A] - On behalf of CGRF, Bhandup

- 1) Shri. S.K. Choudhary, Chairman, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 2) Shri. R.M Chavan, Member Secretary, CGRF, Bhandup.
- 3) Dr. Smt. Sabnis, Member, CGRF, Bhandup.

B] - On behalf of Applicant

- 1) Shri. Saurabh G. Sharma –Consumer Representative

C] - On behalf of Respondent

- 1) Shri. Chandramoli, Dy. Ex. Engr., Panvel (U) Div.

ORDER

Shri. Saurabh G. Sharma is a single phase residential consumer residing at 201-202 Hope House, Kamdhenu CHS. Plot No. 25, Sector No-11, New Panvel, Navi Mumbai. There were two single phase connections under Service No. 028510412429 and 028510412437. The premises was being occupied by the same consumer (i.e. Flat No. 201 and Flat No. 202) the connections were clubbed under service connection of Flat No. 202.

On dt. 05.11.2012 the utility Engineer had checked the meter No. 113958416. and found running fast by 38%. Accordingly rectified the bill awarding credited of Rs. 2919.38, however the consumer was not agreed for this report and reversion of bill and hence did not pay the arrears and result in disconnection of Power supply of consumer No. 028510412429.

As claimed by the compliant the disconnection was without following proper procedure and without issuing 15 days advance notice as mentioned in the section 56 (2) of Electricity Act 2003. The respondent declined it and explain that notice was attached to the consumer's bill and was served.

According to the complaint the meter of service connection No. 28510412429 was running quite fast and hence did not pay the bill. He further explain along with the statement showing the consumption recorded by both meters from Jan 11 to Dec. 11. This accumulated consumption was varying from 250 units to 450 units. He added that after removal of this meter and clubbed under one connection the consumption recorded was dropped drastically.

The complainant reiterated that he has not change or added any gadgets during the above period.

The matter was heard on 18/03/2013. for the interim order and following directives were issued to the Respondent.

The utility should:-

- 1) Accept the min charge and restore the power supply
- 2) No reconnection charges should be recovered
- 3) The Old meters of flat 201 and Flat 202 and existing meter of flat No.202 be tested.

The matter was again hared on 30.07.2013. This delay was due to the extra time requested from both the parties with one or other reasons and hence time limit could not observed.

Both the parties were present, the document on record and arguments during the hearing shows that, there is unexpected

difference between the two results of testing of same meter. when it was tested at sight was found running 38% fast and now in Laboratory it was found working within permissible Limit. It is not understood by us that when it was found 38% fast at sight how it again become ok.

The Respondent was also unable to tress the old meter of Flat No. 202. In such circumstance Forum do not found any ground than to compare the consumption recorded when two meters were provided to the premises with the consumption recorded by the existing alone meter found working within permissible Limit for the use with same gadgets for the period of 12 months after and before clubbing.

The Respondent has passed the credite for fast meter for the disputed period of July 12 to Dec. 12, the credite as per comparative report should passed for the same period.

As stated by the consumer that while comparing the consumption for the two different periods before and after clubbing of meters the units recorded by the meter which was going fast by 38% should be reduced from the collective recorded consumption.

Forum do not agree with the claim because complainant him self was not accepting the report and was disagreed with.

As regards to the compensation against the disconnection without notice, forum has already provided relief to the consumer for immediate restoration of power supply without charging any reconnection charges .

Forum feels that Utility has not followed the proper procedure for this action and hence want a stringent action against the erring officer by the concerned Higher Authority. The Action taken should be Report to this Forum.

ORDER

Application is allotted

- 1) Bill of the consumer for a period of July 2012 to Dec 2012 should be revised according to the comparative report
- 2) Stringent action should be taken against err officer for disconnection of power supply of the Complainant by not following the proper procedure as given in the E.A. 2013.
- 3) The effect should be passed through the consumers current bill within 60 days from receipt of this order.

No order as to the cost.

Both the parties be informed accordingly.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.D.C. Ltd., Bhandup Urban Zone, Bhandup on 07.08 .2013

Note: 1) If Consumer is not satisfied with the decision, he may have representation 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 go in writ before the Hon. High Court within 60 days from receipt of the order.

DR. ARCHANA SABNIS
MEMBER
CGRF, BHANDUP

S. K. CHOUDHARY
CHAIRMAN
CGRF, BHANDUP

R.M. CHAVAN
MEMBER SECRETARY
CGRF, BHANDUP

