

**MAHARASTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO. LTD.**

**KONKAN ZONE RATNAGIRI**

**Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum Ratnagiri**

---

**Consumer case No. – 52/2013**

**Date :- 07.09.2013**

**Shr. Pravin Sahadev Angane.  
House No.1616,Wadekarwadi  
Narayanmali Road, Nachane  
Tal . & Dist-Ratnagiri .**

}

**Complainant**

**V/S**

**Executive Engineer  
Maharashtra State Elec.Dist.Co.Ltd.  
Ratnagiri**

}

**Opposite Party**

**Quorum of the Forum**

}

- 1) Mr. D. S. Jamkhedkar  
Chairman**
- 2) Mr. V.B.Jagtap.  
Secretary Member**

**On behalf of consumer**

}

**Mr. Pravin Sahdev Angane.  
(Consumer)**

**On behalf of opposite party**

}

- 1) Mr.Surendra D.Dange,  
Assistant Engineer, Ratnagiri**
- 2) Mr. Shamkant V.Jadhav,  
Assistant Accountant, Ratnagiri**

## Maharashtra State Electricity Regulatory Commission Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum and Ombudsman Regulation 2003 Vide Clause No.8.2

---

Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. Ratnargiri rejecting the grievance of the consumer, the consumer Shri.Pravin Sahadeo Angane has come in appeal.

Facts of the grievance in brief are as follows.

Consumer is having the domestic connection bearing Consumer No. 210270002506. According to the consumer, he had received the bill for the month of Jan.2013 which is for 675 units and according to him, it is excessive and unreasonable.

So he has requested the forum to quash the impugned bill and to issue fresh bill on the basis of average consumption of earlier 6 Months.

A notice was issued to opponent Mahavitrans to submit the say. Accordingly Mahavitrans has submitted the say. While justifying the reading of 675 units for month of Jan. 2013, it is submitted that there was religious function at the house of consumer and so more consumption might be there. It is on this background the demand for the Month of Jan. 2013 is well justified and the grievance be rejected.

Both the parties advanced their submissions on the lines of their contentions so it is needless to reiterate them.

In view of rival submissions, following points arise for my consideration and I have given findings against each of them, for the reasons given below.

No.	Points	Findings
1.	Whether the impugned bill for the month of Jan.2013 is correct and Proper ?	No.
2.	Whether the bill deserves to be quashed?	Yes
3.	What order	As per final order

## Reasons

### Point No. 1 :-

From the C.P.L produced on record, it is obvious that the monthly consumption of the present consumer earlier to Jan.2013 or thereafter was never so high. The quarterly consumption for the period ending Feb. 2012 is 294 units, for the period ending May 2012 is 524 units, for the period ending Aug 2012 is 330 units and for the period ending Nov. 2012 is 429 units. Thereafter the monthly cycle appear to be there. so we find that the average monthly consumption appears to be in between 100 units to 175 units.

With this background, the reading of Jan.2013 for 675 units is certainly beyond imagination. Mahavitrان tried to justify this bill by submitting that there was religious function at the house of consumer and so consumption was excessive. Mahavitrان was in fact directed to produce some evidence to fortify the submission and for that, time was also granted but without any result. There is no evidence on record to fortify the submission.

With this backdrop, it must be said that the impugned bill for 675 units is highly excessive. So we hold that the bill is not correct and proper and answer the point in the negative.

### Point No.2:-

In view of our finding to Point No.1 the bill deserves to be quashed. Hence we answer the point in the affirmative.

### Point No.3 :-

In the result the impugned bill of Jan. 2013 deserves to be quashed and Mahavitrان will have to be directed to issue fresh bill on the basis of average consumption for the earlier period of Six Months of Jan.2013. Hence we proceed to pass following order.

## Order

- 1) **Consumer's Grievance is allowed.**
- 2) **The impugned bill of Jan.2013 for 675 units is quashed and set aside.**
- 3) **Mahavitrان shall issue fresh bill to the consumer for Jan 2013 on the basis of average consumption for the earlier 6 Months period to Jan.2013.**

- 4) Mahavitrans shall pay compensation of Rs. 500/- (Rs. Five Hundred Only) For the harassment caused to the consumer.
- 5) In case consumer desires to appeal against this order he should file his appeal to the following authority.

**Secretary,  
OMBUDSMAN, Maharashtra State Electricity Regulatory Commission,  
606/608, Keshava Building,  
Bandra Kurla Complex,  
Mumbai – 400 051.  
Phone No.022 – 2659 2965.**

**D.S.Jamkhedkar  
Chairman ,C.G.R.F.  
Konkan Zone**

**V.B.Jagtap  
Ex.Engineer,C.G.R.F.  
Konkan Zone**

**Date : 26.11.2013  
Place : Ratnagiri**