

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
MSEDCL Chandrapur Zone Chandrapur
Complaint No. 5/2017

1. Shri. Balaji Motiram Kashti Applicant
At Post-KhambadaTq. ,Warora
Dist. Chandrapur

V/s

1.The Executive Engineer
MSEDCL O&M Division
Warora Dist. Chandrapur

Respondent

2. The Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer
I.G.R.C. Circle Office
MSEDCL Chandrapur

Applicant Represented by

. Shri. Balaji Motiram Kasht

Respondents represented by

1. Shri. Prashant T. Rathi
Executive Engineer, Warora.

2. Shri. V.N. Bhoyar

Dy-Executive Engineer, Warora Sub-Dn.

CORAM

1. Shri. Vishnu S. Bute - Chairperson
2. Smt. Prajwala M. Kirnakey – Member Secretary

JUDGEMENT

(Delivered on this 29th day of April 2017)

Shri. Balaji Motiram Kashti At. Post-Khambada Tq. ,Warora Dist. Chandrapur (hereinafter referred to as , the applicant) had presented this grievance application. His grievance is about the meter installed in his residence and the bills issued to him by the MSEDCL (hereinafter referred to as, the respondent) He approached IGRC Chandrapur,

Feeling aggrieved by the order passed by the IGRC in case no 12&13/2016 on 30.12.2016, the applicant presented this application under the provisions contained in Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & EO) Regulations 2006 on 02.03.2017.

A copy of the application was given to the respondent .The respondent submitted parawise reply under no. EE/warora/Tech/12/9 Dt. 29.03.2017. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 20.04.2017. Shri Balaji M Kashti applicant himself was present. Shri P.T. Rathi Exe. Engineer and Shri V. N. Bhojar Dy.Exe.Engineer Warora represented the respondent. Both the parties were heard.

4. At the outset the applicant argued that the meter no 1540905 and 1097100 installed at his residence were faulty. The respondents have not explained the parameters to declare the meter as “proper and OK” to the applicant.

In reply the respondent stated that both the meters were tested in the presence of the applicant in meter testing division Warora .The meters were tested after following due process and those were found to be OK.

The applicant simply say that the meters were faulty. The respondent put the meter testing report on record.In absence of any cogent evidence it is not possible to accept the oral objection of the applicant .

The applicant further argued that the respondent issued abnormal electricity bills on the basis of the reading indicated by those meters , namely 1540905 and 1097100.

In reply, the respondent stated that meter no. 1540905 was installed inside the house of the applicant . The applicant used to obstruct the meter reader to take the reading. So the bills were issued on average basis. The respondent installed meter no. 1097100 outside the house on 25.09.2015. It was entered in the system in Dec 2015.

The respondent produced a copy of CPL of the applicant. On perusal of the CPL the billing done is as under

Billing month	Meter status	reading	Reading	units
Dec 15	Normal		32	31
Jan 16	INACC		32	110
Feb 16	INACC		32	110

Mar 16	INACC	32	110
April 16	INACC	32	110
May 16	Normal	409	377
June 16	Normal	810	401
July16	Normal	885	75
Aug 16	INACC	885	184
Sept 16	INACC	885	184
Oct 16	INACC	885	184
Nov 16	Normal	2979	2094
Dec16	Normal	3030	51

December 2015 to December 2016 is the disputed period. However, on perusal of the CPL, it reveal that in most of the months for one reason or the other the meter reader could not record actual readings. So he mentioned that the meter is inaccessible. On 19.12.2016 a representative of the respondent visited the residence of the applicant. He took actual meter reading. The inspection note is on record. Thereafter the applicant was given a bill on the basis of the actual meter reading. That is the bill of Nov. 2016. It is of 2094 units. Since the bill is issued on the basis of the actual reading and as per laboratory report the meter was OK it cannot be said that bill was wrong and excessive. So we reject the aforesaid contention of the applicant.

The applicant argued that there were no arrears against him even then the respondent issued the bills with arrears.

The respondent stated that after receipt of the spot inspection report dt. 19.11.2016 a bill of Rs. 16295 for 2094 units was issued in Nov. 2016. On receipt of a complaint from the applicant, a bill was revised. The applicant was given a credit of the amount deposited by him. Since the applicant had not paid the amount as per the revised bill the arrears reflected in the bills.

We have perused the CPL. It is seen that in NOV. 2016 a bill as per actual meter reading was issued. Thereafter the respondent gave a credit of Rs. 6114 /- against the

amount credited by the applicant. Since the applicant had not paid the subsequent bills the arrears reflected in the bills.

In view of the position discussed above, we do not see any merit in the application filed by the applicant.

So we pass the following order,

ORDER

- i) Application no. 4 / 2017 is hereby dismissed
- ii) No order as to cost

(Smt. Prajwala M. Kirnakey)
Member Secretary

(Vishnu S. Bute)
Chairperson

CONSUMER GRIVENCES REDRESSAL FORUM
CHANDRAPUR ZONE. CHANDRAPUR
29 th day of April 2017

