



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/ 0156/ 0178 OF 08-09**  
**OF RAMA RANGU GHODESWAR REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER**  
**GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN**  
**ABOUT EXCESSIVE BILLING.**

Mr.Rama Rangu Ghodeswar  
C/O. SHRI RAMBHAU TUKARAMJI  
MOHAKAR, At & Post – Washind (E)  
Jijamata Nagar, Nr.Vastu Mangal Bldg.  
Tal. Shahapur, Dist.Thane : 421 604

(Here in after  
referred to  
as consumer  
representative)

**Versus**

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its  
Assistant Engineer O&M Sub-Division  
Shahapur,Dist.Thane 421 604

(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 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 L.T. consumer of the licensee connected to their 415-volt network. The Consumer is billed as per residential tariff. The consumer is Shri Rama Rangu Ghodeswar, and Shri Rambhau Tukuaramji Mohakar, is user of the electricity. The consumer registered grievance with the Forum on dated 06/01/2009 for excessive billing. The details are as follows: -

Name of the consumer :- Shri Rama Rangu Ghodeswar

Address: - As above

Consumer No : - 015510005969

Reason of dispute: Excessive energy bills

- 3). The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by Forum vide letter No EE/CGRF/Kalyan/015 dated 06/01/2009 to Nodal Officer of licensee. However, the letter is replied incomplete during hearing on 05/02/2009.
- 4). The Members of the Forum heard both the parties on 05/02/2009 @ 15.00 Hrs. in the meeting hall of the Forum's office. Mr Ram Mohkar, Consumer's Representative and Shri Y.V.Kamble, Nodal Officer In-charge, Shri S.S.Nalke, Jr.Engineer and Shri V.S.Mithe, Asstt.Acctt. representatives of the licensee attended hearing.
- 5). The consumer representative stated that the Oct.02 bill of Rs.2690 was faulty. He approached licensee when they reduced the bill to Rs.2120 giving credit of Rs.570/-. He paid the same on 25.11.02. They did not correct this in the future bills or in the record and continued to issue faulty bills till today. He written several letters to the licensee dated 3.1.05, 20.12.07, 8.02.08, 20.6.08, 06.09.08, 20.10.08 and 17.12.08.

He also met the officers personally. But nobody was ready to hear his complaint and solve his problem or give proper guidance. Instead they gave evasive and arrogant reply. In almost bills, remark given as "lock" or "faulty". Meter readers are not taking the reading regularly and when they submit reading, they charging for whole period without adjusting average billed units and amount for which the payment has already made during these period. When he complained about the not taking reading, licensee said to take the meter reader to your house for taking meter reading and give reading, we will regularize the problem. This is not consumer's responsibility. The meter was inside the house. In Nov.07 the meter shifted to outside. Eventhough the remarks such as RNT, FLTY, RNA, LOCK etc. continuously printed in the bills. He said he is paying the bills regularly.

- 6). He objects the way the licensee billing half-hazardously without taking meter reading, effecting the reduced amount and dealing the consumer arrogantly. Even passing the remark by higher officer as "CPL copy may please be issued to the consumer" the lower staff do not give copy of CPL. Why action has not been taken against the staff for disobeying the instructions of higher officers. They give arrogant replies and instructed to go here and there. If this is the fate of an educated person like me, what would be the fate of an ordinary uneducated person. They unnecessary given me harassment and mentally tortured due to which he was in tension and admitted to Hospital. The licensee should give compensation for mental torture. The consumer expressed his dissatisfaction that he asked some queries vide his letter dt.3.1.05, dt 20.12.07 licensee not bothered to reply. Now he has got a bill of Rs.5528/-.

- 7) The consumer further stated that frequently the licensee disconnected his supply as if he is a defaulter making a show in front of the neighbor and public which seriously damaged their status in the society against which he demanded compensation. Forum asked whether licensee demanded RCC or you paid RCC any time. He said licensee not recovered RCC. He further went saying regarding the corrupt practices of the licensee officers. Forum warned and instructed to stop such discussion which are irrelevant with this case. Finally consumer said all the bills should be corrected from Oct.02 and issue valid bill and take severe action against all the concerned persons who harassed him for last six years. Consumer again stated that when he asked a copy B-80 they refused stating that this is internal matters which we can not give.
- 8). The licensee stated that as per CPL there is no any adjustment of Rs.570/- and the consumer in way not eligible for such adjustment. As per the CPL there are no irregularities in the billing. The consumer has not paid the electric bills regularly therefore arrears gone up. He paid Rs.1146 on 30.12.00, and after one year he paid Rs.1200 on 14.12.01, in a gap of one year he paid Rs.2120/- on 25.11.02, again after three years he paid Rs.2000/- on 29.11.05, and after about two years he paid Rs.2000/- on 27.08.07. From Aug.07 he has not made any payment. From this it is clear that the consumer was irregular in payment. Whatever payment he made is credited his account against arrears. If the reading is not made available to the billing section in any particular months, and after receipt of actual reading, the bills are revised considering the charged units and payment made are adjusted. The remarks of 'LOCK', "RNT" etc. were pertaining to the period when the meter was inside the house or during the period of meter change. From

April 04 to June 04 reading was not taken and afterwards bills are given regularly as per the readings. When asked the forum whether the meter was changed they said 'yes', the meter was changed in Nov.97 because of the demand of consumer as he felt the meter is rotating fast. As per old meter reading he was billed at 74 units per month for two months and on new meter reading 70 & 75 units for two months on the basis of this, bills are revised therefore it is correct. Reading on the old meter was 74 units. Licensee agreed that consumer has been charged 77 units excess which has adjusted in the B-80. After sanction of B-80 a correct bill will be issued and a reply will be given to the consumer.

- 9). On the above query the licensee replied to the forum that whatever part amount paid by consumer in 1/2/3 years duration, are adjusted in the principle amount only and interest is carry forwarded adding the interest on balance arrears. If the part payment is adjusted towards interest, the principal amount will go up and interest on principle amount would come more. The bill issued for of Rs.5528/- is pertains to both the meters.
- 10). The licensee added that when the consumer got correction in one bill, he imagined that his bill is fault because he got correction. Therefore all the bills are faulty and he will get corrections in every bill. The bill which gave –Rs.750/- was not faulty. The licensee could not justify this correction and found no reason for such a correction. Because there is no any complications in the CPL record. This may be given as part payment against the total arrears or made it for convenience and satisfy the consumer. There is no reason appear in the record or justification recorded anywhere. Licensee stated that Jan.08 bill printed as faulty because meter was changed and B-80 processed for sanction. On

query of why faulty is appear in the bill eventhough the meter is o.k., the licensee said when the consumption feed less than the particular unit, the computer system shows either reject or faulty status.

11). The licensee has not submitted pointwise reply alongwith CPL for the period in dispute. Therefore Forum asked the licensee to submit details as follows:

- a). Consumption in the old meter upto change of the meter.
- b). Bill issued and payment made by the consumer
- c). B-80 details and final amount which consumer has to pay
- d). Case history upto from Oct.02 to Feb.09 and the bill to be paid by consumer in Feb.09 finally.
- e). Nodel officer has been directed by the forum to submit detail statement regarding total charges and paid amount from Oct.02 to Feb.09 and adjusting the payment made by consumer. Also instructed the licensee that they should take all efforts to clear the doubts of the consumer. The consumer generally do not dispute the payment unless they feel any doubt in any bill. If their doubts are not cleared in time, this will lead to misunderstanding and dispute the bills.

12). At the conclusion, the forum informed the consumer that we have asked full history of the case. On receipt of the information and after study of the case, we will give our decision. In the meantime you will also get the revised bill from the licensee.

13. Forum's observations:

- a). The papers as asked for are submitted by licensee on 12.2.09 vide letter No. 1072 dt. 12.2.09. After studying all the

documents made available to the forum, forum come to the following conclusion.

- b). In Oct.02 the consumer received a bill of 71 units for Rs.170.06 + arrears Rs.2076.41+ interest Rs.444.39 + DPCRs.3.09. totaling to Rs.2693.95 paid amount Rs.2120.00 on 25.11.02, balancers. Rs.573.95.
- c). The consumer has paid Rs.2000/- on 29.11.05 against bill of Rs.4448.43. The consumer again paid Rs.2000/- on 27.8.07 against the bill Rs.5082.79. d). After going through the table submitted by the licensee, forum noted that the consumer was not regular in payment. After a part payment on 25.11.02, he made next payment after three years i.e. on 29.11.05. And next payment made on 27.8.07 i.e. after 21 months.
- e). The licensee have issued the bills regularly. But when consumer given a bill dt.23.10.02 corrected (i.e. minus given by Rs.570/-) manually by the Asstt.Engr., the consumer felt that all the licensee's bills are faulty and required correction from that date and approached the licensee for corrections. Therefore he did not pay the bills regular with an intention that his all bills corrected. But as per licensee's CPL there is no irregularities and consumer is not entitle for such credit.
- f). The licensee replaced the meter in the month of Nov.07 with initial reading of 0001 and meter number 45339. Old meter No. is 29703, final reading was 4315. Credit of Rs.274.89 was given to the consumer through B-80 in Jan.08.
- g). After studying the CPL, the statement submitted by the licensee and the payment status of the consumer as on Dec.08 on 15

Grievance No.K/E/156/0178 of 08-09  
units Rs.103.70 + arrears Rs.2926.16 + interest Rs.2263.97 +  
DPC Rs.2.11 thus the total bill of Rs. 5295.94 is correct.

- h). The action taken by licensee in the billing is correct. But the licensee, is in fault in not removing the misunderstanding of the consumer. It is the responsibility of the licensee to clear the doubt whenever they approached the licensee.
14. After hearing both the parties, studying all available documents submitted by Licensee as well as consumer, forum unanimously passed following order.

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

- 1). The licensee is entitle to recover the arrears as on December 2008 amounting to Rs. 5295.94 from the consumer.
- 2). The demand of compensation against harassment and mental torture, is hereby rejected.
- 3). Taking of action against the licensee's officers is not necessary.
- 4). Consumer can file appeal against this decision with the Ombudsman at the following address.

*"Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission,  
606/608, Keshav Building, Bandra Kurla Complex, Mumbai 51"*  
Appeal can be filed within 60 days from the date of this order.

**Date : 17/02/2009**

(Sau V. V. Kelkar)  
Member  
CGRF Kalyan

(M.N.Patale)  
Chairman  
CGRF Kalyan

(R.V.Shivdas)  
Member Secretary  
CGRF Kalyan



