



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 : 01/04/2013  
Date of Order : 25/06/2013  
Period Taken : 85 days

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/709/835 OF 2013-14 OF SHRI NANA SHANKAR PATIL OF KALYAN [WEST] REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN REGARDING EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL**

Shri Nana Shankar Patil,  
Wadegar Gaon,  
Near Marathi School,  
Shanti Bai Nagar,  
Kalyan [West] – 421 301  
Consmer No. 020024181287

} (Here-in-after  
referred  
as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its  
Dy. Exe.Engineer, Sub Division-II,  
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 01/04/2013 for Excessive Energy Bill.
3. The papers containing above grievance were sent by Forum vide letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/0208 dated 2/4/2013 to Nodal Officer of Licensee. The Licensee filed its reply on 20/5/2013.
4. Consumer's Representative (C/R) attended and made submissions. On behalf of Licensee Nodal Officer, Mr. Patil, Asst.Engineer-Mr Bharambe and Asst. Accountant, Mr. Kadu of Licensee attended and made submissions.
5. We have gone through the reply filed by Licensee dated 20/5/2013 and other papers in the file. On the basis of submission made and papers placed on record following factual aspects are disclosed:-
  - a) Applicant is having residential connection from 30/6/2008.
  - b) In Dec.'2011 Consumer's old meter bearing no.1685093 was replaced with new meter no.04282622.
  - c) In the month of Aug.'12, bill was issued showing units consumed to the extent of 8371 and bill was to the extent of Rs.92,295.25 ps. Licensee contended that it covers period from Dec.'11 to Aug.'12, i.e. for 9 months.
  - d) That the said meter, i.e. 04282622 is also taken out on 20/07/12 as Consumer committed offence u/s 135. Towards that action he paid energy charges of Rs.1639/- on 20/7/12 and compounding charges of Rs.4,000/- on 1/8/12 thereby his supply was restored but a new meter i.e. 76/11099304 was installed and reading of said meter at the initial stage was 5212.

- e) Accordingly for the month of Aug.'12 consumption through that meter is shown as previous reading 5212 and current reading 6372, i.e. 1160 units, however, accumulated units by way of adjustment are shown to the extent of 7457.
6. The dispute is pertaining to this quantum of 7457 units. Admittedly from Dec.'11 to July'12 as contended by Licensee actually the reading is not recorded per month. Random recording is there. However we have noticed that working of meter is said to be normal. Then questions comes up how accumulated figure of 7457 cropped up. In this regard we tried to find out whether the said meter no.4282622 was tested; was it correctly giving the display? In this regard one more clue found available from the file, probably during pendency of the matter before IGRC, letter is addressed by Dy. Exe.Engineer to Jr. Engineer vide letter dated 13/2/2013 for submitting a report of testing done in presence of Consumer for his three meters is 4282622, 7611099304 & 8202067159. Accordingly meter at serial no.(1) stated above was of vital importance and this testing report was not available on record till this date. Total dispute found revolving around the said units reflected to the tune of 8271 and correctness of said meter. Consumer in common man's tone has disputed the aspect contending this particular consumption is not correct. Under such circumstances the inspection of this meter found will help us in deciding the aspect hence the Officers of Licensee were asked to clarify this aspect and place the material before this Forum.
7. In response to it, on behalf of Licensee, it was submitted that meter bearing no. 4282622 tested on 11/6/13 in presence of Consumer and its working found okay. Error was within permissible limit. Accordingly, on behalf of Licensee it was submitted that bill issued is covering units as per the reading reflected therein. The Officers of Licensee placed before us the register of testing wherein signature of Consumer is seen. Its copy is filed before us.

8. Consumer admitted that on the date of meter testing, i.e. on 11/6/2013, he was present. C/R submitted that when meter report is available, about its correctness he cannot add anything towards it. C/R was made aware that there is a scope to seek meter testing if he is aggrieved towards it with some other laboratory at his cost and in case report is in his favour, amount will be refunded to him. However, he refused to go for any such further meter testing.
9. From the aforesaid sequence, it is clear that Consumer's meter found not defective, it is correct one and bills are prepared as per the reading reflected therein. We tried to bring it to the notice of Consumer that he can go for further testing at his cost and will get refund of it in case the meter testing is found in his favour but he refused to go for it. Under such circumstances we find that meter testing report is available, it is correct and hence when Consumer is not disputing the said report, it needs to be accepted. The bare claim of Consumer that consumption shown therein is totally baseless or high cannot be accepted. In result, this grievance is to be dismissed.
10. This matter could not be decided in time as meter was to be tested in presence of Consumer and it took time. Even Consumer's Representative did not attend on the date fixed.

Hence the order.

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

Grievance of Consumer is 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”*