



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 : 16/02/2013  
Date of Order : 12/08/2013  
Period Taken : 177 days

**IN THE MATTER OF GRIEVANCE NO. K/E/693/819 OF 2013-14 OF SHRI RAKESH SHAH OF MANIKPUR, VASAI (EAST) REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE, KALYAN ABOUT EXCESSIVE ENERGY BILL**

Shri Rakesh Shah  
New Lawrence Trade Centre,  
Manikpur, Vasai (East) 401 202  
Consumer No. 001699030370

(Here-in-after  
referred  
as Consumer)

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution  
Company Limited through its  
Dy. Exe.Engineer, Vasai S/dn, Vasai (W)

(Here-in-after  
referred  
as Licensee)

Appearance : - C.R. - Shri Harshad Sheth  
For Licensee - Shri S.S. Bakshi, Exe. Engineer  
Mr. V.C. Patil, Executive Engineer, Vasai Division  
Shri Jadhav, Dy. Exe.Engineer, Vasai [West] S/dn  
Shri S.D. Gaikwad, Exe. Engineer, Vasai Division  
Sau. Ovhal, Jr. Engineer, Vasai [West] S/dn  
Mr. V.R. Patil, Engineer, Vasai [West] S/dn

(Per Shri. Sadashiv S. Deshmukh, Chairperson)

1. This Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum has been established under "Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance

Grievance No. K/E/693/819 of 2013-14  
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 L.T.-II(c) supply from the Licensee. The Consumer is billed as per said tariff. Consumer registered grievance with the Forum on 16/2/2013 for Excessive Energy Bill.
3. The papers containing above grievance were sent by Forum vide letter No. EE/CGRF/Kalyan/0112 dated 18/2/2013 to Nodal Officer of Licensee. The Licensee filed its reply on 12/4/2013 & 20/4/2013 vide letter no.1194 & 1397 respectively.
4. The Consumer herein is having supply from 2/8/2007. It is a L.T. supply and assessed as per LT-II-c. Sanctioned load is of 107 KW whereas sanctioned demand is of 80 KVA.
5.
  - (a) Consumer received bill for the month of Dec.'12 covering the period from 2/11/2012 to 2/12/2012. He contended the bill is for Rs.1,37,600 wherein P.F. penalty is worked out and charged to the extent of Rs.49,942.06 ps. This amount is challenged, contending that P.F. is worked out by Licensee as 0.235 which is not correct but in fact it comes to 1.00, thereby P.F. penalty is not applicable. On this count the amount charged on P.F. penalty to the tune of Rs.49,942.06 ps. is sought to be refunded with 7% incentive to the tune of Rs.5,127.83 ps. On this count the Consumer addressed letter to the Exe.Engineer, Vasai on 15/12/2012.
  - (b) On the very day, i.e. on 15/12/2012, he preferred application to IGRC, submitted it on 17/12/2012. IGRC decided the said matter on 7/3/2013. The claim of Consumer is not accepted by the IGR .

Grievance No. K/E/693/819 of 2013-14

(c) As IGRC not accepted the claim, the Consumer approached this Forum with grievance on 16/2/2013. Licensee replied it on 12/4/2013. Consumer placed on record rejoinders dated 18/3/2013, 16/4/2013, 6/5/2013 & 21/5/2013. Those are replied by the Licensee on 20/4/2013, 4/5/2013 & 20/5/2013.

6. In this matter, C.R. attended regularly but for the Licensee different officers attended the matter who were posted from time to time.
7. In this matter, we heard both sides time and again as both parties as they were concentrating on interpretation of mode of working out P.F., more particularly the circular issued by the Chief General Manager (IT) of Licensee dated 20/7/2012. In this light matter was argued; on behalf of Consumer reliance was placed on the order of Hon'ble Ombudsman passed in Representation No.10 of 2013 dated 6/3/2013 in the matter of Supreme Industries Ltd. v/s Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd. The Hon'ble Ombudsman in Para 2 of the order dealt the facts therein and aspect of working out P.F. and observed as under:

“Gist of Representation is that up to Nov. '11, Respondent calculated average P.F. by one method :  $kWh \div kVAh$  and from Dec.'11 by another method:  $kWh \div \text{SQRT}(kWh^2 + RkVAh^2)$ . Ideally the average P.F. calculated by both the methods should be the same but the bill of Dec.'11 shows average P.F. calculated by the first method is 0.999 and by second method as 0.986. ..”

Thereafter the Hon'ble Ombudsman considered the clause 2.1 (d) of MERC (Supply Code) Regulations pertaining to average P.F. in Para 8, referred to Annexure I of the appropriate tariff schedule of MERC Tariff order dated 12/9/2010 in Case no.111 of 2009 which speaks about P.F. calculation. Two

modes are given, one after another and in Para no. 9 of the Hon'ble Ombudsman's order, it is observed as under:

“Plain reading of above provisions make it abundantly clear that whenever average measurement is not possible through the installed meter, the kVAh shall be calculated as  $= \text{SQRT}(\text{kWh}^2 + \text{RkVAh}^2)$  and average P.F. shall be calculated as  $= \text{kWh} \div \text{kVAh}$ . In this case, measurement of kVAh is possible from the reading of the installed meter. Therefore, average P.F. shall be calculated as  $= \text{kWh} \div \text{kVAh}$  for giving P.F. incentive in the bills. Accordingly to the values of kWh and kVAh, taken from the meter readings, average P.F. for the month of Dec.'11 is  $4994500 \div 499500 = 0.999$  and the average P.F. for the month of Jan '12 is  $5203000 \div 5218500 = 0.997$ . The Appellant is therefore entitled for 7% incentive by taking into consideration the Power Factor level of 1.00 as shown in the above table for the month of Dec. '11 as well as Jan.'12. The Respondent is, therefore, hereby directed to work out P.F. incentive in terms of the above tariff order and give necessary credit, in the Appellant's ensuing bills, towards rectification of errors in the said two bills of Dec.'11 & Jan '12, accordingly.

8. Though it is contended by the Licensee that the above order of Hon'ble Ombudsman is not applicable to the present matter, the C.R. submitted that by all means this order is applicable to the present case. We find question before Hon'ble Ombudsman was pertaining to two modes stated for working out average P.F. and while stating so, in Para 4 the Hon'ble Ombudsman noted that there was an error in the measurement of RkVAh for the month of Dec.'11 & Jan.'12 and thereby P.F. needs to be re-calculated correctly. Accordingly, error in recording measurement of RkVAh is dealt therein. Similarly in the matter before this Forum, it is demonstrated by the C.R. that already two factors are

Grievance No. K/E/693/819 of 2013-14 visible from the readings available in the meter of Consumer pertaining to kWh and kVAh. However, the figures in RkVAh are not tallying. This aspect is for disputed month of Dec.'12 which is now conceded by the Officers of Licensee. The Consumer has worked out the said aspect and sought incentive to the tune of Rs.5,127.83 ps. Those details are as per the following chart.

Month	KWH			KVAH			RKVAH			P.F.	KVAH BY	P.F. BY	RECEIVED INC.	CHARGED PENALTY TO WAIVE	INCEN. TO RECEIVE
	Prev. Reading	Current reading	Total kwh x 2 MF	Prev. Reading	Current reading	Total kwh x 2 MF	Prev. Reading	Current reading	Total kwh x 2 MF	kvh / kvah	Sq. Root	Sq. RT formula			
Dec. '12	159431	162224	5586	167883	170675	5584	420553	432131	23156	1.000	23820	0.2345		49,942.06	5,217.83

9. We find as the Officers of Licensee conceded to the error apparent in showing RkVAh, now this claim is to be allowed. Accordingly, the Licensee is required to refund the P.F. penalty, DPC and interest recovered and pay the P.F. incentive admissible after verifying the figure worked out by the Consumer.
10. As per the judgment of Hon'ble Ombudsman no more comments are required on the circular issued by the Chief General Manager (IT) of the Licensee dated 20/7/2012. The judgment of Hon'ble Ombudsman referred above speaks itself. Accordingly this grievance is to be allowed.
11. In this matter the Forum was required to deal the aspect, hearing both parties time and again, these parties added from time to time their contentions, precedents, supplemented their arguments. As matter was of importance due to technical aspect, both parties were given time to make their submissions.

Hence the Order

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

- a) The grievance of the Consumer is hereby allowed.
- b) The bill for the month of Dec. 2012 and charging of P.F. penalty is set aside.

Grievance No. K/E/693/819 of 2013-14

- c) Licensee directed to work out afresh correctly the Average Power Factor, i.e. P.F. as discussed above for the month of Dec.'12 considering the kWh, kVAh which is visible from the meter and reading available. Thereafter refund the P.F. penalty, DPC and interest imposed and recovered from the Consumer and provide incentive, if found payable. This be done within 45 days from the date of receipt of this order and amount so found due to be paid to the Consumer or be adjusted in the ensuing bills. Interest be paid as per Bank Rate for the amount deposited by Consumer as per the bills which is required to be refunded.
- d) Compliance be submitted within 60 days of the receipt of this Order.

Date : 12/08/2013

**I Agree**

**I Agree**

<b>(Mrs. S.A. Jamdar)</b>	<b>(Chandrashekar U. Patil)</b>	<b>(Sadashiv S. Deshmukh)</b>
<b>Member</b>	<b>Member Secretary</b>	<b>Chairperson</b>
<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>	<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>	<b>CGRF Kalyan</b>

**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”*