



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/048/0055 OF
06-07 OF SHRI AJIT BHOJRAJ MEHBOBANI WITH
CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN
ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT THE EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL.**

Shri. Ajit Bhojraj Mehbobani Here in after
Shop at Subhasha Nagar,
referred to
Ulhasnagar – 3
as consumer

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution (Here in after
Company Limited through its referred to
Kalyan Circle II 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 Commission vide powers confirmed 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-volt network. The electricity bill stands in the name of consumer He has two meters with the following details
 - Meter No. 1. 6000402488, Consumer No. 021510677011 for three-phase LT power supply.
 - Meter No. 2 900638430, Consumer No. 021510140998 for single-phase Factory lighting supply.

The details are as follows.

Name of the consumer: Shri Ajit Bhojraj Mehabobani

Address: Same as above

Consumer No. 021510677011(3 phase)

021510140998(1 phase)

Disputed period: - May 2005 to October 2005 for three phase connection

June 2005 to October 2005 for single phase connection

*Disputed amount:- Rs.5,00,000 against meter No. 6000402488 as compounding charges
Rs. 10,000 compounding charges
against meter no. 9006384000*

- 3) The consumer approaches the forum on 03/03/2006, as he was not satisfied with the decision of the ICGRF. The forum asked for the details about consumer grievance from Nodal Officer Kalyan II vide letter No.0474dated 10/03/2006 for his para wise comment within 3 days the letter remain unreplied till today.
- 4) In the absence of any reply from Nodal Officer klayan II the consumer grievance was registered in forum dated 16/03/2006. The forum once again asked for the details vide this office letter No. 0480 dated 16/03/2006 with para wise comments on the papers from Nodal Officer the same remains unreplied till today.
- 5) The forum wrote 3rd letter to Nodal Officer Kalyan II again on 20/03/2006 vide this office letter No. 0486 and asked the reason for disconnection of power supply and explanation for non reconnection. A period of 7 days was given to the licensee for submission of reply if no reply is received within stipulated period then forum would pass an order to words reconnection of power supply. The reply was not received for this letter also.

- 6) The consumer wanted to remove the compounding charges levied by licensee as theft case against he him, which was not proved.
- 7) The hearing was scheduled on 10/04/2006 at 15.00 hrs. and the consumer and licensee were asked to attend the hearing.
- 8) The hearing held on 10/04/2006 at 15.00 hrs and attended by both forum's members, Member Secretary R.G. Maheshwari and Member Mrs. V.V. Kelkar. Licensee's representatives Shri H.K. Randive Nodal Officer, Shri Rajiv N. Kher U.D.C and T.N. Chandran Sub Engineer and consumer representative Shri R.C. Teckchandani repeated his grievance during the hearing.
- 9) The licensee representative submitted Xerox copy of **Panchanama** dated 15/12/2005 and Xerox copy of the **First Information report (FIR)** dated 20/12/2005 filed against the consumer.
- 10) The forum asked the consumer to furnish the copy of the same.
- 11) The forum asked the licensee to produce the test report along with the meters for verification as of meter condition and it's testing laboratory report.
The hearing was adjourning till 17/04/2006 at 12.00 hrs.
- 12) The second hearing held in Fourm's office on 17/04/2006 at 12.00 hrs. Both forums' member Member Secretary Shri. R.G. Maheshwari and Member Mrs. V.V. Kelkar

Licensee representative Shri. K.G. Gorade DYEE, Shri. Y.V.Rathod Sub Engineer, Rajiv. N. Kher UDC, Shri Mahato helper, consumer Shri Ajit Bhojraj Mehbobani and his representative R.C. Tekchandani were present at the time of hearing.

- 13) The licensee's representative produces the only meters without their test reports. When questioned for the absence of test reports, the licensee said that the meters being a static meters it wasn't necessary to test it as seals were found tempered and letter for the same will be provided to the forum.
- 14) The consumer identified the meters and the representative of the licensee Shri Gorade, Shri Rathod, Shri Kher and Shri Mahato who had earlier came on 15/12/2005 for meter reading.
- 15) The forum notices that the both meter seal to be tampered. Reading of both meters were noted down and they are as follows
Meter No. *6000402488- Reading 05410*
Meter No. 900638430 -Reading 05410
- 16) The consumer agreed to pay the assessment bill of Rs. 66,889/- and Rs. 14,446/- on 20/04/2006.
- 17) Forum's finding
 - 1) The licensee did not reply to any of the three letter sent by forum and produce the required details only on the day of first hearing

- 2) The consumer did not defend his grievance at the time of hearing.
- 18) The licensee submitted the letter DYEE S/D2/ULH-2/252 dated 19/04/2006, The letter for the justification of not testing the meter indicating that “ The meters seals were tempered; since the meter trough which theft is done is non static meter such type of case the quantum of the theft is not decided by testing the meter”. Secondly the licensee in continuation to their first letter 252 dated 19/04/2006 submitted a letter No. DYEE/ULHSII/SDn 2/273 dated 27/04/2006 for the justification of not testing the meter stating that “disturbed the status quo of meter installed in above said premises, so result of the testing of meter cannot be truth full for deciding the quantum of theft”.
- 19) On the basis of **tempered seal, Panchanama and FIR Report** the forum agrees with the view of licensee and as such the case is under section 135. The case is disposed of, as it does not come under the purview of CGRF.
- 20) No order is passed by CGRF.

Date: - 27/04/2006 not perview

(V.V.Kelkar)
Member
CGRF Kalyan

(R.G.Maheshwari)
Member Secretary
CGRF Kalyan

