



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/306/343 OF 09-10 OF  
SECRETARY HILL QUEEN APARTMENT WATERPUMP, ULHASNAGAR  
REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL.**

Secretary, Hill Queen Apartment  
Waterpump, O. T. Section  
Ulhasnagar : 421 004

} (Here in after  
referred to  
as Consumer)

**Versus**

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its Dy. Executive  
Engineer, Ulhasnagar Sub-Dn No. IV

} (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 (MERC) 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 Three phase LT consumer of the Licensee. The Consumer is billed as per residential tariff. The consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 03/11/2009 regarding Excessive Energy Bill. The details are as follows: -  
Name of the consumer : Secretary, Hill Queen Apartment  
Address: - As above  
Consumer No : 021514443669  
Reason for Dispute : - Regarding Excessive Energy Bill
- 3). The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/901, dt. 03/11/2009 to the Nodal Officer of the Licensee, and the Licensee through Dy. Ex. Engr. MSEDCL Ulhasnagar Sub/Dn-4 filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/Sub.Dn.IV/CGRF/1640, dt. 17/11/09.
- 4) The Members of the forum heard both the parties at length on 02/12/2009 @ 16.00 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office. Shri R. V. Purohit, N.O. Shri V. D. Kale Asstt.Engr., Shri D. G. Koranne Dy. Ex. Engr. Shri Burujwale, Jr. Engr. representatives of the licensee, Shri Ashok Deepchandani, Shri Rajkumar S. Kotwani, Shri Puran Jyotwani consumer representatives attended hearing. Minutes of the hearing including the submissions made by the parties are recorded and the same are kept in the record. Submissions made by the parties in respect of grievance since already recorded will be referred to avoid repetition.
- 5) According to the consumer Society earlier Electro mechanical meter No. 6000648726 was installed for the use of the Society and that average consumption was 40/50 units per day and the average bill was Rs. 8,000 to 10,000 per month. In the month of March 09 the said meter was replaced by a Static meter No. 08272170. Society received bill as per

the new installed meter for the month of September 09 showing consumption 35480 units amounting to Rs. 2,43,750/-. It is contended that this bill amount is very much excessive compared to the bills of the earlier period and therefore according to the Society licensee be directed to issue revise bill of minimum amount.

- 6) Opponent licensee contravened the above said allegations intending that during meter reading programme for the month of May, June, July & August 09 Electro magnetic meter of the society was replaced by static meter on 16/03/09, the meter reader observed abnormal consumption on the meter and hence to avoid wrong excessive billing, average bill showing meter reading status inaccessible or lock was issued. The meter was accuchecked on the site on 04/09/09 and 05/09/09 and it was observed that functioning of the meter was within the permissible limits. The connected load on the meter was measured manually and found 25 KW, the MD recorded by meter 28.80 KVA. Considering the total connected load and MD recorded by meter and accucheck results, the consumption recorded by new meter was correct. Reading was effected in energy bill of Sept. 09 by giving total six months consumption and hence consumer received the bill in Sept. 09 as per reading and bill for six months bifurcated total consumption. It is averred by the licensee that above position was discussed with the consumer office bearers and that time consumer requested to allow them to pay the bill as per the new meter by installments and accordingly consumer paid Rs. 25,000/- on 30/09/09 and agreed to pay the remaining bill amount upto 05/10/09, however consumer did not pay the bill hence disconnection notice was served. In short, according to licensee bill was correctly issued as per the correct meter reading and the consumer is liable to pay bill amount of

Sept. 09 Rs. 2,43,750/- and on this background according to licensee grievance application being meritless be rejected.

- 7) On perusal of the record and hearing both the parties following points arise for the consideration of Forum and findings thereon for the reasons recorded below :

Points	Findings
a)Whether the electricity bill issued by the licensee to the consumer for the month of Sept. 09 is correct ?	Yes
b)What Order ?	As per order below

Reasons

- 8) Consumer submitted that since the installation of new meter electricity consumption bill has not been issued correctly and that bill for the month of Sept. 09 showing consumption 35480 units and the bill of Rs. 2,43,750 is incorrect and excessive. In support of their contention they have filed the bills for the month April 08 to August 09. These bills show average consumption units 699 to 1160 units per month. Licensee dispute the same contending that during the meter reading programme earlier meter was replaced by static meter. This meter was accuchekek and found functioning within permissible limits and when connected load on the meter was measured manually, it was 25 KW and as such consumption recorded by new meter was correct and accordingly in the energy bill for the month of Sept. 09 total average of six months consumption was taken bifurcating the total consumption and this position was brought to the notice of consumer and accordingly they paid the amount of Rs. 25,000/- on 30/09/09 by way of installment towards the total bill of Rs. 2,43,750/-.

- 9) On perusal the noting it is seen during the course of argument the officer of licensee was directed to produce document to show that at the time of replacement of meter reading was “zero” and accordingly copy of meter replacement report dt. 03/11/09 placed on record. This report dt. 03/11/09 shows the details of old meter and new installed meter. Re-testing report dt. 04/11/09 indicates static replaced meter was found within permissible limit. Meter inspection report dt. 21/10/09 shows this static meter No. 8272170 when manually checked found in working condition. This shows sanction load was 2.20 KW whereas connected load on the meter was 28.8 KVA i.e. 14 times more than the sanction load. This shows consumption was as per the connected load of the meter and consequently consumption units are more. It is not that the consumption is less and still the bill is more. It is apparent as per the connected load and that meter is in OK condition, consumption as shown in the bill for the month of Sept. 09 is as per consumption and by no stretch of imagination bill can be said to be unreasonable and excessive.
- 10) It is to be noted that in the bill Sept. 09 which according to consumer is very much excessive, office of licensee bifurcated the bill slab wise of six months consumption and accordingly credit is given to the consumer. So far the grievance of the consumer that their consumption was average 40 to 50 units per day is concerned, sanction load is 2.20 KW whereas connected load is 28.80 KVA i.e. 14 times more thereby the consumption unit is bound to increase and on this background earlier consumption was 40 to 50 units per day has no relevance. In fact as per the MERC Rules and Regulations consumer cannot consume electricity more than the sanction load, thereby connecting load to the extent of 28.80 KVA is unauthorized. On perusal the testing report and the CPL and the

documents as a whole, we find no fault with the office of licensee and that the charged bill for the month of Sept. 09 is as per the consumption and it is correct. Grievance application as such made with a view to avoid payment will have to be rejected. Point is answered accordingly and hence the order :

### **ORDER**

- 1) Grievance application is rejected.
- 2) Stay Order issued vide Letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/903, dt. 03/11/09 is vacated.
- 3) The Consumer can file representation against this decision with the Ombudsman at the following address.

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

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

Date : 14/12/2009

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

(R.V.Shivdas)  
Member Secretary  
CGRF Kalyan

(S.N. Saundankar)  
Chairperson  
CGRF Kalyan