



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: 22/02/2013
Date of Order : 08/05/2013
Period taken : 75 days

ORDER IN GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/697/823 OF 2012-2013 IN RESPECT OF SHRI CHINTAMAN VITHAL AHER OF KALYAN (E), REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL

Shri Chintaman Vithal Aher
Adarsha Co-op.Hsg. Society
Room No. 2/3.
Chikani Pada, Tisgaon Road
Opp. Ganesh Apartment
Kalyan (East) : 421 301
Consumer No. 020200009828

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited through its
Dy. Exe.Engineer, Kalyan (East) Sub-Divn.-I,
Kalyan

Here-in-after
Referred
As Consumer

(Here-in-after
referred
As Licensee

(Per Mrs. S.A. Jamdar, Member)

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 residential consumer of the licensee. The Consumer is billed as per the residential Tariff. Consumers registered grievance with the Forum on 22/2/2013 for Excessive Energy Bill

The details are as follows :

Name of the consumer :- Shri Chintamani Vithal Aher

Address: - As given in the title

Consumer No : - 020200009828

Reason of dispute : Excessive Energy Bill

3. The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/134 dated 25/2/2012 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The licensee filed reply vide letter No. DYEE/KLN(E)/Sub-Divn.-1/651 dated 18/3/2013.
4. We heard both parties.
5. The Consumer Mr. Chintamani Vithal Aher is the owner of the premises, situated at Tisgaon Road, Kalyan (East) having Electrical connection for residential premises vide meter No. D2773448 with sanctioned load of 2.43 KW.
6. Consumer claim :-
 - a) It is the contention of the Consumer that the said meter was showing correct reading till 25/8/2010 and he was paying the bills regularly.

- b) It is further submitted by the Consumer that his meter was faulty since 24/9/2010 and Licensee has issued wrong electricity bills to him.
 - c) Consumer has also stated that he has requested the officials of the Licensee to remove the defective meter and to rectify the excessive energy bill several times but his efforts to get the bills rectified went in vain.
 - d) It is the contention of the Consumer that he has paid Rs.11,480/- towards the bill of 19 months issued by Licensee on average basis from the month of Sept.'10 to Feb.'12. However, Licensee again issued a bill of Rs.49,000/-showing arrears.
 - e) The further contention of the Consumer that after a repeated follow-up with the Licensee, Licensee has reduced the amount of the Electricity bill to the tune of Rs.12,750/- and asked him to pay the remaining amount which is paid by him.
 - f) Grievance of the Consumer is that he had to face economic loss due to the mistake of employees of the Licensee. He therefore filed his complaint before IGRC but it was dismissed. The Consumer therefore, approached the Forum and requested to give directions to the Licensee for quashing the demand raised by the Licensee in Mar.'12 and to revise the bill.
7. Notice was issued to the Licensee who have filed its reply on 18/3/2013 and submitted that :-
- a) The Consumer was billed on average basis from the month of Sep.'10 to Feb.'12

- b) In the month of Mar.'12 the Officers of Licensee visited the premises of the Consumer and observed that the meter was installed inside the house of the Consumer hence reading was not available.
 - c) The Licensee further submitted that reading on the meter shown 5609 when it was inspected in the month of March 2012. On its basis bill was issued.
 - d) It is also submitted by the Licensee that for a period of 19 months that from Sep.'10 to Feb.'12, Consumer was charged on average basis of 148 units per month.
8. After going through the submissions made by both the parties and the documents placed on record, we find that :-
- a) In Feb '10, Consumer's meter was changed and till Aug.'10, the said meter shown the reading 980.
 - b) From Sep.'10 to Feb.'12 the actual reading of meter was not available in CPL. At times, it is noted as "meter inaccessible", "meter faulty" and one or two occasions as "Normal".
 - c) At the time of inspection in Mar.'12 meter reading shown 5609 and reading 980 was actually noted in Aug. '10. Hence at the time of preparing B-80, the bill was prepared for 4629 units ($5609 - 980 = 4629$ units) and a bill of Rs. 48039.84 was issued giving credit of Rs. 35,712. As against it, Consumer is claiming that he himself has deposited more than Rs.12,740 and he is seeking refund. Probably, the Consumer is laboring under the impression that his consumption was totally less than 150 units as reflected during the period from Sep.'10 to Feb.'12.

- d) It is a fact that Consumer's meter was accu-checked in Mar. '12 and it was found OK. There was no any request for further checking of meter. It is a fact that even subsequent meter is replaced at the request of the Consumer.
- e) It is also disclosed that from Sep.'10 to Feb.'12 units consumed are of 4629 units. This difference is about 19 months. If it is treated as span of 19 months, then the average comes to 243.6 units per month. It is also seen from the record that in the month of June '10, admittedly undisputed position, the consumption was of 248 units,

During Sep.'10 to Feb '12, there was a consumption of 4,629 units. Accordingly, average now worked out by Licensee to the extent of 243.6 units which is not abnormal or inconsistent.

In addition it is noted that Consumer is having supply to the gadgets, i.e. two tubelights, four fans, one fridge, one geyser, one T.V., Washing Machine and one Bulb, i.e. total 2.43 KW load. If it is considered then per month units consumed shown on the basis of average by the Licensee cannot be said to be exaggerated or incorrect.

9. In the light of the above observation, we find no force in the grievance of the Consumer, hence it is to be rejected.

Hence the Order

O-R-D-E-R

- a) Grievance of Consumer is hereby 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, 2003, 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 : 08/05/2013

I Agree

I Agree

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

(R.V.Shivdas)
Member Secretary
CGRF Kalyan

(Sadashiv S. Deshmukh)
Chairperson
CGRF Kalyan