



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/080/0090 OF 06-07 OF
PARANJAPE H. N. REGISTERED WITH CONSUMER GRIEVANCE
REDRESSAL FORUM KALYAN ZONE KALYAN ABOUT EXCESS
BILLING.**

Shri Paranjape H. N.

(Here in after

C/O Shri Parkash Sahabrao Pawar

referred to

Shreedev Apartment Chinch Pada Road

as consumer)

Plot 35, Flat G-2 Katemanivali, 421306

Versus

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution
Company Limited through its Deputy
Executive Engineer, Sub Division No 2,
Kalyan

(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. Consumer is billed as per residential tariff. The grievance was registered with the forum on dated 22/02/2007.

The details are as follows: -

Name of the consumer: - The electricity bill stands in the name of Shri Parkash Sahebrao Pawar but Shri H. N. Parajape is in possession of premises residing there.

Address: - As above

Consumer No: - 020850736180

Reason of dispute: - Excess bill of the month of January 2007 of 207 units amounting to Rs 933/- when his consumption during last one year has not exceeded 13 units per month.

3) The batch of papers containing above grievance was sent by forum vide letter No.0847 dated 23/02/2007 to Nodal Officer of licensee. The letter, however, remained unreplied.

4) All three members of the forum called both the parties for hearing on 22/03/2007 but Shri Paranjape did not attend. He requested Forum, vide his letter dated 19/3/07 addressed to licensee & copy to Forum

(letter received by Forum on 21/3/07), to dispose of the matter in light of his submissions made vide his letter dated 1/3/07 addressed to Forum (letter received by forum on 2/3/07). Shri M. N. Pachlore Deputy Executive Engineer, Shri M. A. Atre, Assistant Engineer, Shri V. D. Zalte Junior Engineer & Shri A. A. Rathod Assistant Accountant representatives of the licensee attended hearing.

5) Shri Paranjape disputed consumption of 207 units recorded on meter number 136611 during the period from 5-12-07 to 5-01-07 shown in the billing month of January 2007. He complained to licensee vide his letters dated 22/12/06, 26/12/06, 11/1/07, 19/1/07 & 20/1/07. The chain of events of the case is summarized below.

- i) He noticed consumption of 88 units on meter (1100-1020) during the period from 4/12/06 to 22/12/06. This according to him is either due to fault in meter or someone was using energy during his absence. (letter dated 22/12/06)
- j) He also noticed consumption of 99 units on meter (1199-1100) during the period from 22-12-06 to 26/12/06. He requested temporary disconnection of supply if necessary in the interest of safety & repair of existing meter or replacement of meter. (letter dated 26/12/06)
- k) He claims of switching of main switch of his premises on 26/12/06 but the meter reading on 4/1/07 was 1232 i. e. consumption noticed during the period from 26/12/06 to 4/1/07 was (1232-1100) 132 units. He noticed same reading of 1232 even on 11/1/07 & also noticed all four indicator lamps stopped glowing. (letter dated 11/1/07)

- l) He pointed out that the meter was tested by licensee's staff on 15/1/07 & found to be within permissible limit of error (2.42 % & 2.70 % fast). The said meter No.136611 was also tested on 20/3/06 & the error at that time was found to be 5.57 % & 5.65 % fast. The reason of this change in test result is not understood by him. He further claims that tendency of unauthorized use of energy by someone could have been arrested in time had the licensee attended to his grievance promptly without delay. There was a delay of about 25 days. (letter dated 19/1/07)
 - m) Licensee replaced meter No.136611 on 19/1/07. (letter dated 20/1/07)
- 6) Licensee vide letter dated 16th March 07 replied consumer in response to his above letters. The abstract of main points are given below.
- i) The old grievance of consumer for meter number 136611 was solved on 15/6/07 to the satisfaction of consumer. The bills thereafter were sent to consumer as per consumption recorded on meter.
 - j) The meter No.136611, as per present grievance of consumer, was tested on 15/1/07 at site & found to be within permissible limit of error. The bill of 207 units of the period from 5/12/06 to 5/1/07 was sent to consumer as per consumption recorded on meter. The responsibility of safe custody of licensee's meter, erected at consumer's premise by licensee, rests with consumer. The licensee is responsible for safe custody of its equipment upto point of supply. Beyond point of supply consumer is responsible for safety of its electrical installation to avoid unauthorized use of supply by someone.

- k) The meter No. 136611 has been replaced by meter number 5600749 on 19/1/07 & this meter is working properly as per test carried out by licensee's staff on 7/2/07.
 - l) The consumer was given an offer to get the meter tested at licensee's laboratory by paying Rs 100/- as testing fees.
- 7) Shri Pachlore submitted copy of meter testing report of testing of meter in licensee's laboratory on 17/3/07. The meter was found to be working within permissible limit of error.
- 8) The Forum draws following conclusion from chain of events of case.
- i) The consumption of 207 units recorded in the billing month of January 07 as compared to last one year trend of consumption (maximum 13 units per month) is much higher. Since the meter was working within permissible limit of error as tested by licensee & the consumer claims of not having used the energy, the possibility of high consumption recorded on meter may be due to either leakage of current in the electrical installation of consumer or use of energy from consumer's meter by some one. The consumer claims to have tested his electrical installation & it was found to be O. K. The possibility of some one using energy from consumer's meter during the period from 5/12/06 to 5/1/07 cannot be ruled out. The consumer at all times is indeed responsible to keep his electrical installation in safe condition to avoid its misuse. We do not find any reason to change 207 units charged by licensee as recorded on meter.
 - j) The forum also noticed that there was delay by licensee of about 25 days in attending to the grievance of consumer. Complaint of 22/12/06 was attended on 15/1/07. This complained, if attended

promptly, probably would have helped consumer in arresting tendency of person trying to use energy through his meter. The licensee, in future should try to attend to such complaints promptly by devising suitable method.

k) The consumer's impression of all four light emitting diodes (LED) of meter glowing at a time needs to be technically explained. The function of each LED & the circumstances under which it glows also needs to be explained. The reason of different meter test result carried out on 20/3/06 & 15/1/07 also needs to be explained. Shri Pachlore of licensee promised Forum to explain to consumer the function of LED of meter & phenomenon of testing of meter.

9) Compliance on points mentioned in Para 8 (J & K) above should be submitted to forum within 30 days. The case stands disposed of with this finding.

Date: - 29-03-07

(Sau V.V.Kelkar)

Member

CGRF Kalyan

(I.Q.Najam)

Chair person

CGRF Kalyan

(D B Nitnaware)

Member Secretary

CGRF Kalyan