

**MAHARASTRA STATE DISTRIBUTION COMPANY LTD**

**KALYAN ZONE,**

**KALYAN**

**Phone 1) 2210707**

**2) 2328283**

Office of the Consumer  
Redressal  
behind Tejashri,  
Cherwanji Road,

---

**Ext-122.**

---

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/017/0019 OF 05-06  
OF SHRI SURESH DATTU PATIL REGISTERED WITH  
CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN  
ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT THE EXCESS BILLING.**

Shri Suresh Dattu Patil

H.No. 427, Near Lalit Weigh Bridge

Manpada Pin Code 421304

(Here in after  
referred to  
as Consumer)

**Versus**

Maharashtra State Distribution Company Ltd,  
through its Assistant Engineer,  
Sub Division Phase 2, Dombivali

(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 2003" 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 L.T. consumer of the licensee connected to

their 415 V network

using energy for commercial purpose. The electricity bills stands in the name of Shri Suresh Dattu Patil who is the owner of the premises of House No.427, Near Lalit Weigh Bridge, Manpada Pin 421304. In the said premises, an industry called Laxmi Box Industries is doing the business of manufacturing of corrugated boxes and using electricity for commercial purpose. Shri N.G. Joshi is the proprietor of the said industry. Shri Joshi registered grievance with forum on 25/5/2005. The details are as follows.

Name of the consumer: - Shri Suresh Dattu Patil

Address same as above

ConsumerNo:-020710003930

*Grievance: - Disputed action of excess billing of January 98 to July 99 (excess billing of Rs 23404/-) & double billing of earlier consumption in November 2004 amounting to Rs 9594/- & withdrawal of interest of Rs 8000/- charges charged on these*

*amount by the license.*

- 3) The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by forum vide letter no. 193 dt 30<sup>th</sup> May 2005 to Nodal Officer Pen of licensee. The letter, however, remained unreplied.
- 4) All three members of the forum heard both the parties on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2005 from 15 hours to 16 hours in the meeting hall of the forum's office.
- 5) Shri Joshi represented the case for consumer. Shri Hundekari Assistant Engineer & Shri Ketkar UDC defended the case for licensee. Shri Joshi repeated grievance mentioned in his application submitted to forum on 25<sup>th</sup> May 2005. The details are given in para 2 above. Shri Hundekari was asked to reply on points raised by Shri Joshi. He promised to reply on or before 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005.
- 6) Shri Hundekari submitted reply on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2005 vide his letter dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2005. He clarified that supply of consumer was disconnected in the month of August 99 for non-payment of bills from 29<sup>th</sup> April 99. The supply of consumer was reconnected, when he made part payment of Rs 9000, on 27<sup>th</sup> August 99 but details of reconnection was not fed to computer till March 2004. First bill was generated by computer in November 2004 as per meter reading & sent to consumer. The average consumption works out to be 180 units approximately per billing cycle.
- 7) Shri Hundekari also clarified in the said letter that meter status was shown faulty in the month of November 97, January 98,

March 98, May 98, July98 and September 98. The regular reading was taken in the month of November 98 when the consumption was noticed 1259 units. This consumption also works out to be approximately 180 units per billing cycle.

- 8) Shri Hundekari submitted a bill of Rs 1500 of the billing month of May 2005 withdrawing interest & delayed payment charges & charging only tariff charges applicable. He said the bill has been revised for 26 months based on 180 units per billing cycle from November 97 to November 99 and the bill has been sent to consumer. The details are given in table below.

<b>Bill of billing month of May 2005</b>	
Original bill	Rs 31890/-
Revision	Rs (-30390/-)
Net bill	Rs 1500/-

- 9) The consumer has paid the said bill of Rs 1500/- on 24/6/2005. The consumer has also paid Rs 590/- on 6/6/2005 against the original bill of Rs 31890/-. The consumer, being satisfied with the action of licensee, has withdrawn complaint vide letter dated 27<sup>th</sup> June 2005 addressed to forum.
- 10) The forum passes no order as the consumer has withdrawn complaint. In view of this, it is not necessary to go into the merit of the case.

**Date:- 1/7/2005 CONSUMER**

<b>(S.H.Chaphekarande)</b>	<b>(V.V.Kelkar)</b>	<b>(I.Q.Najam)</b>
<b>Member Secretary</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Chair person</b>
<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>	<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>	<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>