



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 / I / 010 / 762 OF 2011-2012 OF SHRI POPAT MAHADEO HUNDEKARI AT WAZAREWADI, MURBAD, REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT INTERRUPTION IN POWER SUPPLY

Shri Popat Mahadeo Hundekari
Wajarewadi, Pimpalgaon
Tal-Murbad, Dist-Thane

} (Here-in-after
referred
as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited through its
Assistant Engineer, Murbad Sub-Divn.
Murbad

} (Here-in-after
referred
As Licensee)

(Per Shri. Sadashiv S. Deshmukh, Chairperson)

1. Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established under "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. – IV Agricultural & L.T.-1 Residential consumers of the licensee. The Consumer is billed as per the said Tariff. Consumers registered grievance with the Forum on 11/10/2012 for Interruption in Supply.

The details are as follows :

Name of the consumer :- Shri Popat Mahadeo Hundekari

Address: - As given in the title

Consumer No : - 019817000170 PC-7 Agricultural

& Consumer No.:- 019322139899 PC-6 Residential

Reason of dispute : Interruption in power supply

3. The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/714 dated 22/2/2012 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The licensee filed reply vide letter No. SE/KCK-II/Tech/5299 dated 20/11/2012.
4. We heard consumer in person and Nodal Officer, Mr. Giradkar, Asst.Engineer, Shri Suradkar. We have gone through in detail documents and reply of the Licensee filed from time to time..
5. On the basis of arguments advanced and material placed on record following factual aspects are disclosed.

A. Consumer is having supply to his residence and to the agricultural pump from the Licensee. He filed Grievance in this Forum on 11/10/2012 as his applications filed with concerned Engineers not properly dealt, his Grievances not redressed. He is quoted four Grievances. Those are :-

- i. Interruption in supply
- ii. Agricultural pump could not be operated as D.P. blown

and due to looping

iii. Low Voltage problem

iv. Demand of expenses towards new DTC

6. Consumer along with this Grievance Application , annexed papers, with List, Sl.Nos.1 -18, Ann-1 & 2 are the bills and others are letters written by him to the officers of the Licensee.

Out of it, letter at sl.no.3 & 4, 5, 6 & 7, 12-14 are pertaining to irregular supply and failure, etc.

Whereas letters at sl.Nos. 8-10, 11, 15-17 & 18 are pertaining to excessive bill and corrections in it.

The officers of Licensee replied this grievance submitting it on 20/11/2012 & on 20/1/2013 through Nodal Officer.

7. In this matter we asked both sides for details. Some details are provided from Licencee but consumer has not responded towards his grievance of bills issued for more amount shown in the current bill

He has not produced the bill about which he is disputing and even had not shown the said item in the grievance application filed on 11/10/2012. Hence the annexures to the applications at sl.No.8 -11 & 15-18 cannot be decided by this Forum. The said grievance is not substantiated and supported with material by consumer. Even we find said aspect pertaining to Annexure 8 to 11 dealt upto Hon'ble Ombudsman on which no any comments can be done by this Forum.

8. Grievance of consumer as stated in his Application dated 11/10/2012 are in four heads, but the initial three are inter-related. The fourth one, pertains to DTC expenses demanded, which are paid. The

details thereof are not provided hence it cannot be dealt by this forum. Even Consumer has not explained it. Licensee in reply dated 20/11/2012 challenged the aspect of DTC amount demanded.

9. On behalf of Licensee the initial three grievances in the Application are replied on 20/11/2012 through Nodal Officer and explained the position. However, on 16/3/2012 the detailed explanation submitted towards the same as referred by the consumer in his application annexed at sl.No.3-7 & 12-14. It is explained that those grievances are redressed on the concerned dates of letters or prior to the dates mentioned in the letters. Summary of those details are as under:

- a) In respect of proper supply during the period from 20/1/2012 to 25/1/2012 it is submitted that grievance redressed on 21/1/2012 and again on 26/1/2012 it was verified and verification was shown to the consumer.
- b) During the period from 22/2/2012 to 1/3/2012 about the improper supply, etc. it is claimed that on 23/2/2012 this grievance was redressed and again on 2/3/2012 it was confirmed about the redressal.
- c) During the period from 9/3/2012 to 19/3/2012 grievances are redressed on 09/3/2012, 10/3/2012, 12/3/2012, 14/3/2012, 16/3/2012 and finally it is confirmed on 19/3/2012
- d) During the period from 20/7/2012 to 31/7/2012 due to rainy season the H.T. line was affected and at times it was working and at times there was a failure due to rains and storms, electric poles were damaged and line was disrupted. Even due

to lightning H.T. line pins were broken and it led to the disruption which was an Act of GOD, i.e. Vis majeure. However, total supply was restored on 31/7/2012 and 3/8/2012. These compliances are stated by the concerned Engineer in a written reply and there is no any reply from consumer side to contradict it.

10. As against explanation and details provided by officer of the License no any substantial material is placed by the consumer. The Consumer all the while indulged in putting one or other typed application before this Forum about the grievances of the incidents during the pendency of the matter. On those Applications he was asked to follow appropriate course as those are independent. Even we find he has indulged in some practices before officers of Licensee. He addressed letter of some nature right from Asst. Engineer to Superintending Engineer. Accordingly, he maintained copies of those applications and placed before us in the Forum of Grievance. But most of the letters are revolving around common ground that supply is irregular, agricultural crops are affected, agricultural pump could not be operated, even water scarcity noticed for cattles and drinking.
11. This consumer is not approaching the Forum for the first time but it is noted that he is coming in rounds. As per the record this is the third round. In the first round he has gone up to Ombudsman. In second round he has sought relief for billing to his Transformer repairing unit and present is the third one. No doubt, these three are on different grounds but the reason for enlisting these three instances is with

intent to keep it in mind that consumer is not a person who has no any knowledge of the nature of material to be placed for seeking redressal of grievance and replying appropriately whenever any details are called. We noticed the total approach of consumer who appeared in person is evasive and it is not that he is seeking relief by providing required material and data. He is not supporting his case with details of materials. As noted above, he disputed the bills but copies of bills are not produced. The aspect is not cited in the grievance and that every now and then before this Forum he placed Applications of some developments during pendency of this matter which are unrelated to the dispute already pending.

12. In spite of above, we find the complaint Applications which consumer has filed approaching different authorities of same incident are taken care of in time and in one aspect as it was an Act of GOD it was beyond the control of Licensee and hence it is also rectified in due course. The two aspects which consumer has tried to canvas about the bills is beyond the scope of grievance Application and even not supported with material. In respect of DTC expenses it is contended by consumer that these amounts are demanded from Licensee side but details of that aspect are not provided.
13. In spite of execution of new DTC it is claimed that expenses were demanded from him which he has paid but those are required to be refunded to him. The details thereof are not provided to us. Even we find that aspect independent one which was taken by consumer to Hon. Ombudsman and hence if at all any grievance still subsists it is a part of execution of the order already passed and it is beyond our

scope.

14. In result we find this Grievance Application is to be rejected.
15. This matter could not be decided in prescribed time as Forum was to cope up with the existing staff in the background of stenographer retired and stenographer not available, skilled worker available had no knowledge of stenography.

Hence the order

O-R-D-E-R

- a) The Grievance Application of consumer for the reason stated hereinabove rejected.
- b) The Consumer can file representation against this decision with the Hon. Electricity Ombudsman within 60 days from the date of this order at the following address.

“Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 606/608, Keshav Bldg, Bandra Kurla Complex, Mumbai 51”.

- c) Consumer, as per section 142 of the Electricity Act, 003, can approach Hon. Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission for non-compliance, part compliance or delay in compliance of this decision issued under “Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation 2003” at the following address:-

“Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 13th floor, World Trade Center, Cuffe Parade, Colaba, Mumbai 05”

I Agree

I Agree

(Mrs. S.A. Jamdar)
Member
CGRF Kalyan

(R.V.Shivdas)
Member Secretary
CGRF Kalyan

(Sadashiv S. Deshmukh)
Chairperson
CGRF Kalyan