



**Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kalyan Zone**  
**Behind "Tejashree", Jahangir Meherwanji Road, Kalyan (West) 421301**  
**Ph- 2210707, Fax – 2210707, E-mail : cgrfkalyan@mahadiscom.in**

---

Date of Grievance : 18/06/2012  
Date of Order : 06/09/2012  
Period taken : 80 days

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/619/736 OF 2012-2013 OF**  
**SHRI NARAYAN TUKARAM SAKPAL, ULHASNAGAR REGISTERED WITH**  
**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN**  
**ABOUT EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL .**

Shri Narayan Tukaram Sakpal  
Bk. No. 1394/3 - B,  
Ulhasnagar : 421 004

(Here-in-after  
referred  
as Consumer)

Versus

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

(Here-in-after  
referred  
as licensee)

(Per Shri. Sadashiv S. Deshmukh, Chairperson)

- 1) This 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. The regulation has been made by the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission vide powers conferred 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. The Consumer is billed as per residential tariff. The consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 18/06/2012 for Excessive Energy Bill.  
The details are as follows :  
Name of the consumer :- Shri Narayan Tukaram Sakpal  
Address: - As given in the title  
Consumer No : - 021516018230  
Reason of dispute : Excessive Energy Bill
- 3) The set of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/0490 dated 18/06/2012 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The licensee filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/ UIh.Sub.Dn.IV/ Billing/479, dated 05/07/2012 through Nodal Officer vide letter No. SE/KC-II/Tech/3146, dated 09/07/2012
- 4) We the Members of the forum heard both sides in the meeting hall of the forum’s office on 09/07/2012 and 27/07/2012. Licensee is represented by Nodal Officer, Shri. Giradkar, Shri. V. H. Kasal, Asstt. Engineer, Shri.Pachpole, Dy. Executive Engineer and consumer, Shri.Narayan Sankpal is present.

- 5) Consumer, a senior citizen, made his stand clear contending that he had not taken two connections. His meter is not permanently disconnected, but the liability of permanently disconnected consumer number is transferred on his consumer number. He submitted the root of the grievance arose when in the bill issued by the licensee dated 25/01/2008, an amount of Rs.14,120/- is entered and reference is made to consumer No. 021516030884/6 (hereinafter referred to as 'disputed consumer no.')
- and its meter number is shown as 31588684. In this respect, at that time, only consumer has approached the officers of licensee, but the matter was just tossed allowing the consumer to pay the amount pertaining to his utilization. However, again consumer received a bill dated 25/02/2012 for the period from 14/01/2012 to 13/02/2012, therein previous arrears are shown as Rs.15,542.58. However, current bill is of Rs. 241=89. Accordingly, the total of the said bill is of Rs.15,790/-. This bill was disputed by the consumer writing to the licensee on 29/02/2012 to which there was no response. Till then consumer sought information from the licensee under the Right to Information Act and it was clarified by the licensee on 13/06/2012 that bill pertaining to disputed consumer number for Rs.15,442.58 ps is added to his number. Further, it is stated that both connections were given in the name of same person i.e. consumer herein. Hence, that liability is on the consumer. Even in reply herein,, licensee maintained the same stand.
- 6) In this respect, consumer claimed that his consumer No. is 0216018230 and meter No. is 9031588684, however, disputed consumer number as already noted above i.e. 021516030884/6 is not pertaining to him. He

claimed that he has no reason to take two consumer numbers. He showed his total file containing his applications for seeking supply. It pertains to consumer No.0215601832 and even almost all bills paid by him till to the date of final hearing. Accordingly, he placed before us even the chart showing payments done by him. He claimed that to his surprise it is noticed that two consumer numbers are shown on a single meter and this cannot happen. If there are two consumers then there should be separate meters. It may happen that single consumer may be having two more connections of different category having different meters but herein it is not the contention of the licensee. Accordingly, he claimed that the supply given to some other person on some other meter is just diverted on his number and attempt is being done to recover it.

- 7) On behalf of licensee, relying on the CPL, it is contended that two connections are given on the same date in the name of same person, bills are raised and as per CPL previous bills are paid for both connections. Hence consumer herein cannot deny the liability.
- 8) Reiterating his stand, consumer contended that though disputed consumer number is cited, but said connection is shown as permanently disconnected (PD) in February-2008. However, details of said PD connections are not forthcoming such as notice served towards PD, what happened to the meter which is shown as PD, what was its reading at the time of PD. In this light, he contended that it is all false thing manipulated and liability of some other consumer i.e. disputed consumer no. is shown on his meter and recovery is sought which is not legal. He further submitted that in routine whenever any bill was issued obediently payments are made and only on

this basis any payment made on once or more by him cannot be read, as he had accepted the claim of licensee as correct and he is bound to pay the present liability raised. He claimed that being a common person, acted in bona fide manner, but his bona fides are now being misused thrusting on him the liability which is not pertaining to him. Further, he maintained his stand, if at all pertaining to disputed consumer, if that connection is permanently disconnected, there should be some proof to show that there was a meter which was reflecting some reading at the end and it was made disconnected serving notice to the concerned. He has not received any such notice or any such intimation. However, the meter as stated by him is the same for both the consumers hence things are not made clear by the officers of licensee and they have forced him, though a senior citizen to run from pillar to post. Thereby he sought information under the Right to Information Act wherein the aforesaid aspect is disclosed. Accordingly, he contended that demand raised is totally illegal.

- 9) On the basis of above rival contentions, we find, this seems to be a unique matter wherein only one meter is shown in the name of two consumers. One consumer is shown as permanently disconnected. Details of said permanently disconnected meter not forthcoming, what was the last reading, not placed before us, to whom notice was served not clarified and it is clearly seen that the liability of disputed consumer is diverted on the account of the present consumer. We are satisfied that for want of the details pertaining to permanently disconnected consumer and meter thereof, it is not possible to say that there was only one meter and for one consumer it is disconnected. All the while, it is stated on behalf of the

licensee that oer papers are not forthcoming. However, we find, it is not possible to accept that for two consumers only one meter is allotted. Hence this particular aspect goes to the root. When the consumer is confronted with the bill dated 25/02/2012 that too of a permanently disconnected consumer number for Rs.15542.58 ps. he has approached the officers, but there is no any redressal of grievance. We find, said claim of Rs.15542.58 from licensee's side is not at all legal and proper, it is to be quashed. Consumer is a senior citizen he gave vent to his feelings in a peculiar manner befitting to his age. However, the usual reaction and submission on behalf of the licensee is not found in tune with the required sensitivity and accountability.

- 10) Delay is caused in deciding the matter as other heavy matters were to be dealt. Hence the order :

**O-R-D-E-R**

- 1) Grievance No.K-E-619/736 of 2012-13 of the consumer is found correct hence it is upheld. Towards its redressal, the amount of dues i.e. Rs.15,542.58 shown as liability on the present consumer in his bill dated 25/02/2012 is hereby set aside. Licensee to delete the said dues from the consumers account. Matter stands disposed of.
- 2) Compliance be reported within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

- 3) The Consumer if not satisfied, 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”.*

- 4) 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”*

Date : 06/09/2012

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

(R.V.Shivdas)  
Member Secretary  
CGRF Kalyan

(Sadashiv S. Deshmukh)  
Chairperson  
CGRF Kalyan