



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 : 18/03/2013  
Date of Order : 25/06/2013  
Period Taken : 99 days

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/704/830 OF 2012-13 OF MR. ANSAR GULAMNABI AHMED OF KALYAN (WEST), REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL**

Shri Ansar Gulamnabi Ahmed  
204, Sarvoday Sagar, Bldg. No. 10  
Near Patri Pool  
Kalyan (West) : 421 301  
Consumer No. 020025021208

(Here-in-after  
referred  
as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its  
Dy. Exe. Engineer, Sub Division-III  
Kalyan (West)

(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 having residential supply from the Licensee. The Consumer is billed as per said tariff. Consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 18/3/2013 for Excessive Energy Bill.
3. The papers containing above grievance were sent by Forum vide letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/0174 dated 18/3/2013 to Nodal Officer of Licensee. The Licensee filed its reply on 8/4/2013 with CPL and report of meter testing.
4. Consumer in person attended. Shri A.M. Kale, Dy. Exe.Engineer, Shri Patil, Nodal Officer on behalf of Licensee attended. They were heard from time to time.
5. On hearing both sides it is disclosed that the Consumer is having supply from 24/9/08. He received bills for Feb.'12, March '12, Apr.'12 and May '12 respectively for 304, 681, 1340, 738 units and he noted the consumption shown is totally disproportionate to his previous consumption which has not exceeded 255 units, up to January 2012.

He complained about it and sought checking of the meter by depositing amount of Rs.100/- on 27/3/12. Accordingly as per his request the meter was accu-checked on 24/5/2012 and at that time it was noticed that meter was O.K. and there was a permissible error in the meter to the extent of (+) 000.32%.

Accordingly said dispute remained as it is and Consumer filed the said dispute with IGRC on 28/1/2013. The IGRC decided the matter against the Consumer on 11/3/2013 considering meter accu-checked and observed that meter was accu-checked in presence of Consumer. This aspect of meter tested in his presence was disputed by the Consumer. It is seen that on 15/4/2013 the meter was tested in the laboratory, probably suo moto by the Licensee during

pendency of this grievance by the Consumer and at that time error was found to the extent of (-)00.71% and the Consumer as stated above approached this Forum on 18/3/2013 hence the said meter checking in laboratory was during pendency of this matter. The said checking was not in presence of the Consumer and when matter was taken up before this Forum, on 30/4/2013 submissions were made from Licensee side for checking the meter once again in the laboratory in the presence of Consumer. Consumer's meter is tested on 4/5/13, however no official meter testing report is produced, but Xerox copy of meter testing report is placed before us and it is contended that there was no change in the status and it was as per the testing results dated 15/4/13. Copy of it is provided to the Consumer and as per this report the error is noticed to the extent of (-) 00.71%. As noted above the extract of register is placed on record contending that the result is noted on testing remarks entered on 4/5/2013. Accordingly testing report dated 15/4/2013 is endorsed on the testing report dated 4/5/2013.

6. On behalf of the Licensee it is submitted that from June '12 meter reading is consistent; though it is on lower side, it is not in dispute, but there is no reason why it should be below, when this is correct and acceptable, why dispute is for the previous period. They asserted that previous consumption which is in dispute is, as per the reading and reasons are various about such high consumption and those reasons though not exactly known may be due to more use of electricity or somebody was allowed to use it, etc. Accordingly, they contended that whatever bill issued it is as per the reading of meter; meter is not defective; error noticed is within the limits and hence this grievance has no any force at all.
7. The Consumer submitted that previously he had never received any such high bill and now it is totally disproportionate; it has crossed even 3 figures; he contended his family consists of only four persons and utilization is minimum

which is towards one tube light and one fan. Accordingly, he disputed this particular quantum.

8. Ld. Dy. Exe.Engineer submitted when accu-check is done in presence of Consumer and third testing is done in presence of Consumer there is no reason to disbelieve it and it be accepted.
9. Consumer has sought time to apply his mind when he was made aware that in spite of these testing reports speaking about the status of meter that it is not faulty, he can have a testing from other laboratory at his cost and if report comes in his favour, charges will be refunded to him. Consumer was not able to make up his mind and took time. At his instance on 20/5/2013, matter was adjourned to 3/6/2013, again it was adjourned to 18/6/2013. Consumer on 18/6/2013, did not turn up though the Officers of Licensee attended. In this light we perceived that Consumer is not seeking any other remedy for testing the meter. In result we find that meter is tested now and then, reports are speaking about meter not defective and though Consumer claims that he has got the bill for the higher reading there is no merit in his contention that reading is a wrong one or it is an aspect of jumping of the meter. Now we find that this grievance is to be rejected.
10. This matter could not be decided within the prescribed time as Consumer himself has taken time to consider whether to seek any further testing of meter from other recognized laboratory.

Hence the order.

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

Grievance of the Consumer is hereby rejected.

Date : 25/06/2013

**I Agree**

**I Agree**

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

**(Chandrashekhar U. Patil)**  
**Member Secretary**  
**CGRF Kalyan**

**(Sadashiv S. Deshmukh)**  
**Chairperson**  
**CGRF Kalyan**

**Note:-**

- a) The consumer if not satisfied, may file representation against this order before the Hon. 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”.*

- b) 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”*