



Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kalyan Zone
Behind "Tejashree", Jahangir Meherwanji Road, Kalyan (West) 421301
Ph: – 2210707 & 2328283 Ext: - 122

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO.K/E/109/0124 OF 07-08 OF
THE PRESIDENT PARSHWANATH JAIN SANGH REGISTERED
WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN
ZONE KALYAN ABOUT EXCESSIVE FIXED CHARGES.**

The President Parshwanath Jain Sangh
Gandhi Nagar, Bazar peth,

(Here in after
referred to

Kulgaon (E) – 421503.

as consumer)

Verses

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited through its
Deputy Executive Engineer, Badlapur
(W) Sub Division , Badlapur.

(Here in after
referred to
as licensee)

- 1) Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established under regulation of "Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation

2006" to redress the grievances of consumers. This regulation has been

made by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission vide powers conformed on it by section 181 read with sub-section 5 to 7 of section 42 of the Electricity Act, 2003. (36 of 2003).

- 2) The consumer is a L.T. consumer of the licensee connected to their 415-volt network. The Consumer is billed as per residential tariff. Electricity bill stands in the name of The President Parshwanath Jain Sangh, Consumer representative K. A. Jain registered grievance with the Forum on dated 08/01/2008.

The details are as follows: -

Name of the consumer: - The President Parshwanath Jain Sangh & Shri Kantilal Amedmal Jain is a representative of consumer.

Address: - As above

Consumer No: - 021540038811

Reason of dispute: - Excessive billing by wrong meter reading & negligence to resolve the grievance.

- 3) The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No.011 dated 08/01/2008 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The letter was replied by licensee vide letter dated 16/01/2008.

- 4) The Member Secretary & Member of the Forum heard both the parties on 04/02/2008 @ 15 to 16 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office Shri K.A. Jain representatives of consumer and Shri G. N. Bhagat Nodal Officer, Shri R. J. Thool Assistant Engineer, Shri V. J. Kamble Assistant Engineer representatives of the licensee attended hearing.
- 5) The consumer representative repeated his grievance & stated that he

was not satisfied with any explanation given by the licensee. He insisted that his meter was not faulty and the reading taken by the meter reader

was wrong. He also said that he had approached the entire licensee authorities but were no use. The consumer demanded testing of his original old meter, which was replaced by the licensee. The licensee replied that it is not possible because of the unavailability of the meter.

- 6) Licensee replied for this grievance by their Letter No. SE/KC – II/Tech/243 dated 16/01/2008. & submitted CPL at the time of hearing.
- 7) The reading of old meter on dated 18/09/2006. was 17119 & at the time of meter replacement dated 02/12/2006 the reading was 17234.

(The difference is $17234 - 17119 = 115$ units)

- 8) Licensee explained that the average consumption is charged to consumer for the average of 12 months. The 94 units of consumption of old meter calculated as per average basis. & These units are added in the month of December 2006.

- 9) According to the licensee as per the Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL) average consumption of the consumer were 196 units per month. Hence the consumer was charged according 196 units in the month of October & November 2006 . After installing new meter on 02/12/2006 the inshial meter reading was 0002 and when the reading was taken by the meter reader reading was 0105 ($0105 - 0002 = 0103$) on 15/12/2006 thus to account for the average consumption of 196 units, Consumption of 94 units (old meter consumption) were added in the bill of December 2006.
- 10) According to consumer's grievance application was excessive billing by wrong meter reading & negligence to resolve the grievance. Forum

studying record submitted by both the parities following questions are arise :-

- (a) Whether licensee's action for removing meter was correct ?
- (b) Whether licensee charging the average units 196 per month was correct ?

The answer is above questions are: -

- (a) Yes, after studying the Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL) the reading of meter was same for September & October 2006 & for the month of November reading was 17140 (i.e. only 21 units consumption).
- (b) Yes, after studying the CPL the consumption of last month was around 196 average units per month.
- 11) After study the records submitted by licensee forum observed that there is no negligency from licensee side. Hence considering the above facts the action of licensee is correct.

12) In the above circumstances the forum is inclined to pass the following

Order unanimously.

O-R-D-E-R

- 1) As Licensee's action for billing is correct so consumer do not liable for any credit amount.
- 2) The claim of the consumer in respect of compensation for loses is completely disproved and therefore no compensation is payable on this account.
- 3) Consumer can file appeal against this decision with the Ombudsman at

the following address.

Maharastra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 606/608,
Keshav Building, Bandra Kurla Complex, Mumbai 51

Appeal can be filed within 60 days from the date of this order.

Date: - 28/02/2008

(Sau V. V. Kelkar)

(R.V.Shivdas)

Member

Member Secretary

CGRF Kalyan

CGRF

Kalyan