

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESAL FOURM
Maharashtra State Electricity Board

In the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum at M.S.E.B., Bhandup U
Zone,

Vidyut, Gr. Floor, L.B.S. Marg, Bhandup (W), Mumbai - 78

Case No. 17 of 2004
14/03/2005

Date of hearing

Grievancee
M/s. Indian Leather & Handi Craft
Plot No. B-70, Wagle Estate, Thane
Estate.
Consumer representative
Mr. Ashwin Treasurer

Utility : Shri S.B. Wahane
Executive Engineer
O & M Divn., Wagle

The Chairman and all members of the Forum were present. The consumer as well as his representative was present. The Executive Engineer, MSEB, O&M Divn., Wagle Estate, Thane was present.

In his say the Consumer Representative stated as under :

1. Load sanction letter No. EE/THN/Tech 21/6847, dtd. 28/12/1979 is for 49 kW which comes to 65.68 HP and rounded upto 66 HP.
2. Record of security deposit paid earlier by previous owner & record is not available. Record may be obtained from M.S.E.B. shown on bills & interest paid on that security deposit from beginning.
3. Addl. security deposit for Rs. 800/-, firm quotation given vide letter No. BC 3021 No. 27 dtd. 24th Nov. 1980, which might have been paid against load sanction number 6847, dated 28/12/1979. Which is to be confirmed & recorded by M.S.E.B. on bill & interest to be paid.
4. Clubbing of connections i.e. Industrial Power & lighting not done for the period June 1997 to May 1999, which should be effected & difference to be refunded.

Clubbing is for consumption & not for connected load as per Board's resolution No. 724, dated 3rd May 1997, which should be considered while clubbing.

5. From June 1999 to February 2001, clubbing of consumption is done but connected load is not clubbed as Boards Resolution No. 724, dt. 03/05/1997. After February 2001 connected load clubbed considering 1 HP as lighting load, which is not as per Board's resolution, stated above.
6. Meter reading 1476 to 1990 of lighting meter is billed twice i.e. bill for lighting connection was issued as well as power bill with lighting bill was also issued separately - rebilling from May 1997 to upto date is to be done.
7. On 28 the February 2000, Flying Squad assessed 4.1 HP as lighting load as part of total load of 64.9 HP. So net power load is only 60.8 HP i.e. within sanctioned load of 65 HP. But next Flying Squad report of date 3rd March 2003 assessed connected load of power at 64 HP but added without any basis 6 HP for lighting & remark unauthorized load of 4 HP which is in violation of Boards Resolution No. 724.

- This is not unauthorised load. All bills raised & recovered as per above Flying Squad report to be quashed.

8. For Nov. 1996 to August 1997 billed for lighting consumption showing meter status faulty. M.S.E.B. has no right to make any bills as average or otherwise - Decision in case of Topasa Ramasa Patil Vs. K.S.E.B. should be considered & all the bills on average should be squashed. Copy of the decision appeared in AIR 1989 Karnataka 279 at 280 : (1989) 1 Kant L.J. 91 (S. Rajendra babu J.) is submitted at the time of hearing.
9. Bill for March 1998 dated 17th April 1998; current reading taken 468490 on 07/04/1998 is wrong and billed for Rs. 50,762.50 for 20,000 units, which is 10 times high. Credit for March 1998 to May 1998 wrong billing credit not given. It is intimated by consumer.
10. Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate, letter No. 1251 dtd. 12/08/1998 shows connected load 47.5 HP (Industrial) + 1.42 kW lighting - Provisional bill of Rs. 26,765/- issued on the basis of Sub-Engr. report dated 12/08/1998, as per reading 451562 on 12/08'/1998 and provisional bill is for five months i.e.06/03/1998 to 12/08/1998 supplementary bill should be squashed & rebilled.
11. Flying Squad report of 28th February 2000, & 3rd March 2003 should be squashed & reassessed as per Charter Engineers certificate.

12. Consumer's letter dated 26th August 2001 for meter not functioning & replace the meter. Meter replaced on 07/09/2001. Replacement report not given.
13. August 2001 to December 2001 - power bills wrongly charged by considering connected load as 139 HP without inspection report.
14. 1st February 2002 - Consumer has submitted test report for reduced load of 58 HP + 2 kW lighting load. On 7th February 2002 M.S.E.B. was requested to verify. On 13th February 2002, Asstt. Engineer inspected and found connected load 58 HP & reported to Executive Engineer accordingly.

On 27th February 2002, letter given to Executive Engineer protesting against bill for 3,18,470/- and high assessment of 139 HP. On 10th April 2002 again wrote to Executive Engineer, Executive Engineer insisted for 65 HP test report. Hence consumer has submitted 65 HP test report. Finally on 22nd April Executive Engineer approved connected load from 139 HP to 65 HP exhibit No. 17 as per annex. F & informed to consumer vide his letter No. 927 dtd. 22/04/2002 with effect from February 2002 but not effected in billing.

15. From December 2001 to April 2002 adjustment raised & shown as recoverable without giving any details which should be squashed.
16. In Nov. 2003 bill, Flying Squad recovery of Rs. 25,939.37 charged on Flying Squad report dated 03/03/2003 which should be squashed as retrospective for 13 month from May 2002 to May 2003 absurdly high.
17. During 2004, five letters written by consumer, Executive Engineer asked for bill copies from June 1997. On 29th June 2004, copies of bills required were submitted to Executive Engineer; Wagle Estate still revision is not done.
18. On dated 12/08/2004, grievance was lodged to I.G.R.C, Bhandup. Without any hearing, decision was given vide letter No. 8770, dated 07/10/2004 that Rs. 3,550/- will be adjusted in energy bill. Details of 3550/- not given.
19. No clear cut 20 days intimation given on any bills, hence all DPC charged should be squashed & rebilled.

20. Option for L.T. M.D. tariff was given on 17th December 2004. Till to date no action is taken by MSEB.
21. Write-up of connected load assessment is submitted herewith along with charging of fix charges & penalty and period of payment of bill & clubbing of bill, which may be considered while taking decision.
22. Under section 42 (5) to 42 (8) of E.A. 2003 are exhausted, electric supply to the consumer should not be disconnected if deposit under protest is made. Under section 1 (A) or 1 (B) which ever is lower, is made by consumer.
23. Compensation for direct loss caused by breach of Laws, statutory rules & supply condition, more so by service utility & doubly so after due disregard to notice given to licensee.

Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate Thane is as under :

1. Consumer is billed at LT PG. In motive power bill include lighting load also. Lighting meter records only lighting load. The load sanctioned vide letter No. 6847, dtd. 28/12/1979 as 66 HP is correct.
- 2 & 3. The company is export oriented manufacturing unit. If consumer wants to substantiate his claim of having paid addition security deposit, the certified copy of balance sheet from C.A. wherein security deposit & additional S.D. shown in asset may kindly be produced to correct the mistake.
- 4,5&6. Clubbing is done & bills are issued considering Boards Resolution No.724 dtd. 3rd May 1997 & C.E. (Commercial) circular No.292 dated 24/06/1998 and since Nov.'98 bill issued by clubbing Industrial power & lighting connection. June 1997 to Oct. 1998,clubbing done & effect given in Sept. 2004 bill. Bill raised on lighting connection during period Nov.'98 to May 99 are withdrawn and amount received against said bills are credited to Industrial connection in Sept.'2004 bill. Copy of details of the credit given, handed over to consumer personally.
7. Flying Squad report of 28th February 2000 shows connected load as 64.9 HP, which was within sanctioned load. Hence no recovery was charged.

Flying squad report of 3rd March 2003 connected load was found 70 HP by considering all motive power & lighting load. Hence from date of

- detection, last twelve month assessment i.e. from May 2002 to May 2003 (including billing month) was done.
8. Meter was stopped; hence faulty status was shown & bill was raised on average during Nov.'96 to Aug.'97 i.e. up to replacement of meter. The actual consumption after replacement was more than assessed.
 9. Bills issued during March 1998 to May 1998 revised and effect given in Oct.'98 bill.
 10. Provisional bill was issued considering revision of bills for March 98 to May 98 and up to Aug.'98 amounting Rs. 26,765/-, which is correct.
 11. Flying Squad report of February 2000 does not show additional load hence no penalty/recovery charged. Flying Squad report of 3rd March 2003 shows connected load is more than sanctioned by 4 HP. Hence assessment was done amounting Rs. 26,059.37 by 31 (fii) of condition of supply, which is correct.
 12. Meter is replaced & reflected in bill of Sept. 2001.
 13. Inspection report along with record sheet will be submitted & bills issued are correct.
 14. The test report of 58 HP is not received in MSEB. Test report of 65 HP of dated 10/04/2002 received during April 2002. Inspected during April 2002 & effect given from April 2002.
 15. Assessment from Dec.2001 to April 2002 is corrected & details will be submitted.
 16. Recovery charged as per condition of supply 31 (fii) & is correct.
 - 17&18. Revision of bills effected & effect given in Sept.2004 bill. Copy of revision details also given to consumer.
 19. Bills are issued on next date of issue of bills. If consumer requires, duplicate bill can be given.
 20. For LT MD tariff instructions have been given to A.E. Wagle Estate & copies also sent to Circle & Zone. Action will be taken from this month.

The views of Member as well as Member Secretary are different and are expressed as it is :

Views of Member :

1. There is no difference of opinion about sanctioned load as both consumer and utility agreed on it.
2. Security Deposit : It is general practice of M.S.E.B., not to start supply till all payments including Service Line Charges and security deposit charges are paid by the consumer, hence it is certain that consumer has paid security deposit and utility has not shown it in the bills, nor utility has paid interest on S.D.

With regard of additional security deposit Rs. 800/- demanded by the utility, it is not certain that consumer has paid it for two reasons
i) consumer is unable to produce a receipt of payment of security deposit
ii) The sanctioned load is also not increased.

Therefore it can be concluded that consumer has not paid additional security deposit of Rs. 800/- so there is no need to pay interest on it. If consumer can produce the receipt of Rs. 800/- towards security deposit, the utility should pay interest of S.D. from that date of receipt.

The utility should show the original security deposit paid in the bill in accordance to the rate chargeable for 65 HP sanctioned load in the year 1979.

3. It is observed that utility has credited most of the wrongly collected bills & penalties in the subsequent bills but has not given the details of these adjustments along with the bills when these adjustments were given. This act of utility has created confusion in consumer's mind and has aggravated the consumer's grievance.
4. It is shocking to note that in the inspections carried out for connected load calculation, the report does not show the units (KVA/HP/KW) against the machinery but only numbers are written & are added without considering the units which is absolutely wrong & whenever units are shown in the inspection report the numerical total is taken without considering unit & its conversion. This leads to conclusion the utility staff is not carrying out the inspection seriously. In this particular case the inspection report showing 139 HP connected load falls in the above said category & therefore can not be accepted as valid report & consumer was right in refusing to sign it. Secondly in various inspection reports for the connected load the load of light and fan varies from 1 HP to 6.1 HP without giving any details about the loads of light and fan. This is difficult to understand that inspection authorities physically check the light and fan load or not. Report gives impression that they do not check and just mentioned it as over all consideration.

Even in the report where the connected load is shown as 139 HP current drawn by the capacitor is not mentioned. The details of meter working are just mentioned as not properly working. It is difficult to understand how this conclusion is drawn without having details of control CT or control meter. It also comments that supply given to meter after cutout & it should be altered. In fact this thing could have been noticed before starting the supply in the observations of the report. It also mentioned meter is to be replaced immediately as it is not working on applied load but it does not give details what was the load applied. The same report does not show the signature of witness or the consumer on it which creates a doubt in mind whether the inspection report is report of genuine conducted inspection or just created on office table.

5. In April 2002 a BR-46 shows capacitor penalty of Rs. 90,518/- is to be withdrawn in accordance to office order 927. The BR also shows

penalty charged in February 2002 as Rs. 9473.97 and March 2002 Rs. 10044.35 total is 90,518.32.

6. In accordance to general circular (comm. No. 292) dtd. 24/06/1998. The para A of this circular gives guidelines to both of connected load where it states the basis motive power (connected) load of consumer excluding only the light and fan load shall be used to determine tariff slabs to be made applicable. Para B states that for the electric consumption the readings of both to be added together. Para C mentioned fixed charges shall be payable on connected load of a motive power and L & F load from interpretation of A & C of this letter. It can be concluded that no penalty is to be charged if MP (Motive power load) is within the limits of sanctioned load here load of L&F is not be considered therefore even if MP load & L&F load is in excess of a sanctioned load but MP load is within the sanctioned load the penalty is not applicable for example sanctioned load is 65 HP, connected MP load is 65 HP & connected L&F load is 5 HP total load will be 71 HP therefore the fix charges will be $65 \text{ HP} \times 50\% \times 60 + 5 \text{ HP} \times 60 = \text{Rs. } 2250/-$ is to be charged.

Case No. 2 : If motive power load is more than 65 HP say 69 HP & L&F load is 5 HP then fix charges should be charged $69 \text{ HP} \times \text{Rs. } 60 + 3 \text{ HP} \times \text{Rs. } 120 + 5 \text{ HP} \times \text{Rs. } 60 = 4800/-$. Therefore penalty charged for 4 HP excess loads. In accordance to flying squad report dtd. 03/03/03 is wrongly charged because the total 70 HP load as mentioned in this report is inclusive of 6 HP lighting load, hence this should be withdrawn.

Therefore in this case according to above report & circular No.292 the tariff should have been charged Rs. 2280 as the connected MP load works out to total 70 HP-6 HP lighting load=64 HP MP load. This 64 HP MP load should be used for calculation of connected load & this is well within 65 HP sanctioned load. Therefore no penalty is to be levied in this case the report also shows that lighting load should not be considered for calculation of connected load.

Views of Member Secretary

1. There is no difference of opinion about sanctioned load as both consumer and utility agreed on it.
2. Interest on Security Deposit: M.S.E.B. never releases new Industrial connection without security deposit. If record is not available with M.S.E.B. the minimum S.D./H.P. collected by M.S.E.B. in the year 1979 to be considered while calculating the S.D. and interest to be given.
3. Interest on additional security deposit: Consumer is unable to produce the receipt. Demand note produced is not showing any payment details. Hence additional security deposit is not paid, the interest cannot be paid.

- 4,5&6.M.S.E.B. had already given the credit against wrongly collected bills in Sept.'2004.
7. M.S.E.B. has not charged any assessment on Flying Squad report dtd. 28th Feb.'2000, As per Flying squad reports dtd. 3rd March 2003, M.S.E.B. has charged assessment. This assessment comes under section 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum.
 8. M.S.E.B. has charged the bills during the period meter was faulty on the basis of the average consumption when meter was correct before it became faulty. M.S.E.B. has also brought to the notice that the consumption recorded after replacement was on higher side than the average charged. Hence revision not necessary.
 9. M.S.E.B. has given credit against wrong billing in October 1998 bill.
 10. M.S.E.B. has revised the bills from March 1998 to May 1998 and bill issued according to revision for the period March 1998 to May 1998.
 11. M.S.E.B. has not assessed any bill on Flying Squad report of February 2000. M.S.E.B. has issued assessed bill on the basis of Flying Squad report of 3rd March 2003. The assessment comes under section 126 of the Act. & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum.
 12. Replacement details are given by M.S.E.B. in Sept.'2001 bill.
 13. M.S.E.B. has produced the inspection report of August 2001. The assessment bill issued for excess connected load. This assessment comes under Section 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum.
 14. M.S.E.B. has billed considering connected motive power load as 65 HP since April 2002.
 15. Bills issued as per Flying Squad inspection report of August 2001. The bills issued comes under 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum.
 16. Assessment against flying squad report comes under section 126 of the Act, hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum.
 17. M.S.E.B. has revised the bill and credit given in Sept.'2004 bill.

18. As per constitution of Internal Grievance Redressal unit, hearing against grievance is not necessary.
19. M.S.E.B. should give 20 clear days period for the payment of bills. Any bill paid by consumer within 20 days from bill date, D.P.C. & interest if charged should be refunded/credited in energy bill.
20. Action has been taken by M.S.E.B. to implement L.T. M.D. tariff.
21. Issues like connected load, penalty, clubbing of bills etc. have been considered above.
22. M.S.E.B. should disconnect the supply after observing the Act only. Consumer has not produced any documents about illegal disconnection.
23. During the hearing consumer has not put up the specific instances of direct loss caused by breach of laws, statutory rules & supply condition.

Observations of the Chairman :

Both the views expressed by the Member and Member Secretary are no doubt correct & has been considered very carefully by all while taking the decision. The points raised by consumer representative and views of the utility expressed in the written report at the time of hearing for the sake of convenience, the points raised by the consumer's letter and copy of the same has been given to the utility so that the utility gives reply of the points raised by the consumer. Even though the hearing of this case took place on the 14th of the March 2005 both the consumer as well as the utility were asked to

substantiate their say with the documents which were pointed out by them at the time of hearing. The consumer kept on sending written communication expressing his views. Adequate opportunity given to consumer to represent his case. Since the views of the Member and Member Secretary are different and I have dealt with the views in the subsequent paragraphs.

In his say the consumer has said the load sanction letter No. EE/THN/Tech 21/6847, dtd. 28/12/1997 is for 49 kW which comes to 65.68 HP, since there are no two opinions this point is accepted. The consumer in his say further stated that the record of additional security deposit paid earlier by previous owner & record is not available. Record may be obtained from M.S.E.B. & interest paid on from beginning. The Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate in his reply has stated that if the consumer has paid the additional security deposit this can be reflected in the balance sheet in the asset column. The member in his observation has stated that with regard to additional security deposit consumer has not produced receipt of security deposit besides there is no enhancement in the sanctioned load, hence there is no question of payment of additional security deposit. In absence of any proof of payment of additional security deposit the question of payment of interest doesn't arise. While in respect of security deposit the interest may be paid as due as admissible.

The consumer has also argued that the clubbing of connection i.e. Industrial Power and Lighting was not done for the period June 1997 to May 1999 which should be effected and difference to be refunded. The Member Secretary in his views stated that MSEB has already given credit in Sept.'2004.

The Member in his observation however stated that in inspection report connected load calculation, the report does not show the units (kVA/HP/kW) of but only numbers are written and are added without considering the units which is wrong. Only numerical total is taken without considering units. I have perused the report eventhough there was nor mention whether kVA/HP/kW against each number; the grand total shown was 75 HP, I feel this is OK that the total calculated was 75 HP The Member further stated that the inspection report shown in the above said category and therefore cannot be accepted as valid report & consumer was right in refusing to sign it. The Member further stated that even in the report where the connected load is shown as 139 HP current drawn by the capacitor is not mentioned, the details of CT or control meter is not mentioned. The Member further raised serious doubts about genuineness of report. The report was as per the physical inspection carried out on the spot or otherwise. This only

speaks that the staff of utility should be careful in explaining to the consumer. I consider this issued as settled.

The consumer has further stated from June 1999 to February 2001 clubbing of consumption is done but connected load is not clubbed as per Boards Resolution No. 724, dt. 03/05/1997. After February 2001 connected load clubbed considering 1 HP as lighting load which is not as per Boards Resolutions. The Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate has stated that the clubbing of connection is done as per Boards Resolution No. 724, dt. 03/05/1997 & Chief Engineer (Commercial) circular No. 292, dtd. 214/06/1998 & since November 1998 bill issued by clubbing Industrial power and lighting connection. June 1997 to October 1998, clubbing done & effect given in September 2004 bill. Bill raised on lighting connection during period November 98 to May 99 are withdrawn and amount received against said bills are credited to Industrial connection in Sept. 2004 bill. Copy of details of the credit given, handed over to consumer personally, this has satisfied the consumer. As further point of the meter reading 1476 to 1919, lighting meter is revised. In view of the above clarification given by the Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate holds good for this point also statement I am fully satisfied about this point.

As regard the point of assessment, on the basis of Flying Squad visit dt. 28/02/2000 & 03/05/2003, the Member Secretary has stated that the MSEB did not charge any assessment on Flying Squad report of 28/02/2000. Assessment as per Flying Squad report of 03/05/2003 comes under section 126 of the Act and hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum, I agree with him. The consumer further pointed out that from Nov.'96 to Aug.'97 he was billed for lighting consumption showing meter status faulty. He has mentioned the case of "Topasa Ramasa Patil vs. K.E.B." I concur with the views of the Member Secretary that MSEB has charged the bills during the period meter was faulty on the basis of the average consumption when meter was correct before it became faulty & there is no recovery of any sort in the bill.

The consumer made complaints against the bill dtd. 17/04/1998. Current reading taken 408490 on 07/04/1998 is wrong and billed for Rs. 50,762.50 for 20,000 units which is ten times high. Credit for March 1998 to May 1998 wrong billing not given. The Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate has stated bill issued during March 1998 to May 1998 revised and effect given in Oct.'98 bill. The Member Secretary has also agreed with the views of the Executive Engineer. In view of this no further comments are required.

The consumer further stated that the provisional bill for 5 months, supplementary bill should be squashed and rebilled. The Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate has stated provisional bill was issued considering revision of bills for March 98 to May 98 and upto Aug.98 amounting to Rs. 26,765/- which is correct. The Member Secretary has also stated the MSEB has revised the bills from March 1998 to May 1998 and bill issued according to revision for the period March 1998 to May 1998. The consumer has asked Flying Squad report for the year 2002-03 should be squashed and reassessed as per Charter Engineers certificate. The Member Secretary has stated that MSEB has issued assessed bill on the basis of Flying Squad report of 03/03/2003. The assessment comes under section 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum, I agree with this, I don't agree with the consumers demand. The consumer in his letter dtd. 26th Aug. 2001 for meter not functioning & replaced the meter & meter replacement report is not given. Meter replacement is reflected in the bill of Sept.'01. The consumer is making unnecessary issue of the things which he is aware of.

The consumer has pointed out that Aug.'01 to Dec.'01 power bills wrongly charged considering connected load as 139 HP without inspection report. The Member Secretary has stated that the assessment comes under section 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum, I agree with him.

The consumer says that Executive Engineer approved connected load from 139 HP to 65 HP but not effected in the billing. The Executive Engineer, Wagle Estate stated that effect has been given. In view of this I don't accept the Member Secretary say. The consumer further stated from Dec.' 2001 to April 2002 adjustment raised & shown as without giving any details which should be squashed, the Executive Engineer stated that assessment from Dec. 01 to April 2002 is corrected and details will be submitted, as per the say of the Executive Engineer. He is advised that it is his duty to satisfy the consumer.

The consumer further stated that in Nov.03 bill, Flying Squad recovery of Rs. 25,939.37 charged on Flying Squad report dated 03/03/3002 which should be squashed as retrospective for 13 months from May 2002 to May 2003 is very high, since the assessment comes under section 126 of the Act & hence excluded from the jurisdiction of the Forum. The consumer further stated that during 2004 consumer has written 5 letters from June 97 to June 2004, revision has not been done. The Executive Engineer has stated that revision of bills has been effected & effect given in Sept.'2004. The Executive Engineer further stated that the copy of revision details also given to the consumer, In view of this it is not clear that why the consumer has

raised this point. The consumer further stated that on 12/08/2004, grievance is lodged to IGRC, Bhandup, the decision was given vide letter No. 8770, dt. 07/10/2004 that Rs. 3550/- will be adjusted in energy bill. It appears that the consumer is dissatisfied that the decision has been taken without any hearing in the days of transparency when we want to ensure for the utility should explain things to the consumer. It is necessary that the hearing should be given to the consumer; I agree with the point of consumer that he has been deprived of to put forward his view point. Details of Rs. 3550/- are not given. The consumer further pointed out that no 20 days given on any bills, hence all DPC charged should be squashed and rebilled. In the similar case we have observed that 21 days period is not given to the consumer. It is advised that clear cut 20 days should be given to the consumer and request for quashing & rebilling is not acceptable. The consumer further stated option for L.T. M.D. tariff was given on 17th Dec.'04, till today no action is taken. MSEB advised to give effect from Feb.' 2005. The consumer further stated that write up of connected load assessment is submitted herewith along with charging of fix charges & penalty and period of payment of bill and clubbing of bill, which may be considered while taking decision. Decisions have already given on various points raised by the consumer. The consumer has made a broad general request of compensation for direct loss caused by breach of Laws, statutory rules and supply condition more so by service of utility & doubly so after due disregard to notice given to licensee. Since this is general request no discussion on this point which unacceptable. In view of the discussion, following order is passed:

ORDER

1. Security deposit should be shown on bill and interest to be paid from date of connection with interest of 9% on the amount till date. The amount to be considered S.D. for 65 HP in 1979.
2. Utility should give clear 20 days for payment of the bill amount excluding bill date henceforth.
3. As assessment grievance is out of the jurisdiction of the Forum - consumer may approach the appropriate authority at address given below to get his grievance redressed. Forum feels most of the bill adjustments are given by the utility.

Addressed of appellate authority:

Office of the Chief Engineer,
Chief Engineer (Electrical),

Sarvajanik Bandhkam Vibhag,
New Administrative Building,
IIIrd floor, Ramkrishna Chemburkar Marg,
Chembur (E), MUMBAI - 400 071.

Phone No. 25222097.

4. To maintain transparency ICGRC, as far as possible, hear consumer's view point while redressing the Grievance of consumer. Besides as pointed out above it is not clear as to how the amount of Rs. 3550/- is arrived at.
5. L.T. M.D. tariff should be affected from Feb 2005.

The order is issued under the seal of consumer Grievance Redressal Forum M.S.E.B., Bhandup Urban Zone on 4th of March 2005.

Note : 1) If Consumer is not satisfied with the decision, he may go in appeal within 60 days on receipt of this order to Ombudsman in attached "Form B".

Address of the Ombudsman

Ombudsman,
Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,
606-608, Keshav Building,
Bandra - Kurla Complex,
Mumbai - 400 051.

2) If utility is not satisfied with order, it may apply to MERC within 60 days from receipt of the order.

Sandip Pasarkar
(Mane)
Member
Consumer's Grievances
Grievances
Rederssal Forum
Forum

G.R. Jadhav
Member Secretary
Consumer's Grievances
Rederssal Forum

(P.A.)
Chairman
Consumer's
Rederssal

