

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM;
MSEDCL NAGPUR (RURAL) ZONE NAGPUR
COMPLAINT NO. 136/2014

Shri Giridhar Dewaji Jagtap
At. Po.Arvi(Chhoti)
Tq.Hinganghat
District - Wardha.

Complainant

,,VS.,

1. Executive Engineer,
MSEDCL,O&M Division,
Hinganghat.
2. Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer,
I. G. R. C., Circle Office,
MSEDCL,Wardha.

Respondents

Applicant represented by 1) Shri B.V.Betal, Authorized representative
Respondents represented by 1) Shri A.V.Tupkar, Dy.Exe Engineer, Hinganghat

CORAM:

Shri Vishnu S. Bute, Chairman.
Adv. Gauri D. Chandrayan, Member
Ms. S. B. Chiwande, Member-Secretary.

JUDGEMENT

(Delivered on this 12th day of January, 2015)

2. Shri Giridhar Dewaji Jagtap, presented this application on 10-11-2014 feeling aggrieved by the order passed by the IGRC, Wardha on 02-08-2014. The applicant was given a bill of 2483 units in May 2014. It is the contention of the applicant that the bill is wrong and excessive. Hence this application.

3. A notice was given to the respondent. They were directed to submit parawise reply. The respondent submitted parawise reply under no.EE/O&M/H'ghat/T/8575 dated 02-12-2014. The case was fixed for hearing on 05-01-2015. Shri B.V.Betal, was present for the applicant. Shri A.V.Tupkar, Dy.Executive Engineer, Hinganghat

represented for the respondent. Both the parties were heard.

4 Shri Betal argued that the applicant is a domestic consumer. He got the connection on 16-12-2013. Right from the beginning the respondent never took the actual meter reading. They never issued the bill as per actual power consumption. The applicant got the electricity bills showing his consumption on average basis. The consumption was shown as 100 units per month.

In the month of May 2014 the respondent abruptly issued the bill showing his consumption of 2483 units in one month. The respondent did not investigate this huge consumption of the applicant. There is no justification of such an enormous power consumption in one month. So it is clear that there was some fault in the meter. So the bills from December 2013 to May 2014 may be revised.

The applicant requested to test the meter in the authorized laboratory. The respondent say that the meter was tested and it was found to be o.k. However neither the meter was tested in presence of the applicant nor the advance intimation of the meter testing was given to the applicant.

5. In reply Shri A.V.Tupkar referred to the written reply dated 02-12-2014. He further stated that the applicant had not submitted any survey or testing report in support of his contentions. The request of the applicant for compensation has no force. It may be dismissed.

As per the request of the applicant the meter was got tested in the laboratory. The meter was found to be o.k. The bill amount is as per the meter reading and it is just and proper. The applicant is bound to deposit this amount. At the most the applicant

can be granted the instalments to deposit the arrears. The application may be dismissed.

6. The member and the technical member submitted a note as under,

We have gone through the documents on record & submissions made by both the parties, the main grievance of the applicant is about the bill of 2483 units issued in the m/o May 2014 by the respondent. According to the applicant, the said bill was excessive, he gave an intimation in writing to the respondent on 01.07.2014, & on 01.08.2014 that the meter has recorded excessive meter reading & requested for testing of meter. The applicant paid the meter testing fee on 08.08.2014. The said meter was tested in the laboratory on 08.09.2014. As per the testing report the meter was found ok. The applicant, however not agreed with the meter testing report as it was not tested in his presence.

After perusal of the bills, it is observed that the respondent released the supply on 16.12.2013 & issued the first bill in the M/O February 2014 for 163 units of RNA status. Thereafter they issued the bill of 100 units showing RNA status for March & April 2014. The respondent issued the bill of May 2014 for 2483 units showing Previous reading as 2 & current reading as 2485. It may therefore derive that the consumption recorded in the M/O May 2014 was accumulated consumption & therefore it is correct. As per applicant request the said meter was tested & found Ok during testing. However the applicant was not satisfied with the meter testing report as it was not tested in his presence.

Hence we are of the considered opinion that the meter should be tested in the

presence of consumer and accordingly the bill should be revised as per meter testing report.

7. We have perused the record. We have heard the arguments advanced by both the parties.

Main grievance of the applicant is about the bill he got in May 2014. The bill show the consumption of 2483 units in one month. According to the applicant he got the connection in December 2013. His power consumption is very less, say about 100 units per month. The respondent also did not say that the applicant has many installations and his consumption is huge. It is on record that the applicant has been given the bill of 2483 units in May 2014. On perusal of the papers submitted by the parties it is seen that the maximum consumption of the applicant is 234 units in June 2014 and minimum consumption is of 100 units in March 2014 and April 2014. When the respondent issued the bill of 2483 units in May 2014 it was their duty to investigate as to why there is such a big consumption in one month. There is no submission from the respondent that the applicant was given the average bill and the bill of May 2014 indicate accumulated consumption. There is no argument from the respondent that the applicant consumed more power on account of some programme or due to some other reason. The respondent had not investigated anyway the reason behind the huge consumption of the applicant anyway. On the contrary the respondent submitted the reply casually and carelessly. The complaint of the applicant is about the excessive bill issued to him. The applicant is a domestic consumer. The reply dated 02-12-2014 submitted by the respondent starts as, “ vtZkj Jh xhjh/kj nekth txrki j jk-vkohZ/kohZ ; kauh

cl'khi i kpsufou oht i jpb; kl mHkZ I mHkZcdz1 ubkj rdzj I knj dgh p

8. So there can be only reasonable and convincing conclusion that the respondent issued a bill of 2483 units for one month as there was some fault in the meter and it indicated wrong and excessive reading.

As per the provisions of Regulation 8.1 the Forum has to take decision by a majority of votes of the members of the Forum.

In the instant case the Chairman is of the opinion that the meter was faulty. The bill of 2483 units need to be quash and set aside. The respondent should give a bill for May 2014 as per the provisions of Regulation 15.4.1

However other two members recorded their opinion that the meter should be tested in the presence of the applicant. He should be given a revised bill as per meter testing report.

In view of the aforesaid situation, we pass the following order, by majority,

ORDER

- i) The application no.136 of 2014 is partly allowed.
- ii) The respondent should test the meter in the presence of the applicant. The respondent should issue a revised bill as per the meter testing report.
- iii) The parties to bear their own cost.

<p>Sd/- (Adv.Gauri D.Chandrayan) <u>MEMBER</u></p>	<p>sd/- (Ms.S.B.Chiwande) <u>MEMBER SECRETARY</u></p>	<p>sd/- (Vishnu S. Bute) <u>CHAIRMAN</u></p>
<p><u>CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM; NAGPUR ZONE NAGPUR</u></p>		
<p><u>(Nagpur Dtd.12th day of January, 2015)</u></p>		

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
NAGPUR ZONE (RURAL) M. S. E. D. C. L.
Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni,
NAGPUR – 440013

Email.id- cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in
cgrfnz@gmail.com

(O) 0712- 2022198

NO. CGRF/NZ/

Date :

Certified copy of order dated 12th January, 2015 in Case No.136 / 2014 is enclosed herewith.

Member-Secy/ Exe.Engineer,
C.G.R.F.(NZ)MSEDCL
N A G P U R

To,
Shri Giridhar Dewaji Jagtap At.Po.Arvi(chhoti)
Tq.Hinganghat, Dist.Wardha

Copy s.w.r.to :-

1. The Chief Engineer(NZ), MSEDCL, Vidyut Bhavan,Katol Road, Nagpur.

Copy f.w.cs.to:

1. The Executive Engineer/Nodal Officer., O&M Circle Office, MSEDCL.Wardha
2. Executive Engineer,C.C.O&M Dn., MSEDCL, Hinganghat.
for information and necessary action.

Address of the Electricity Ombudsman is given as below.

Office of - The Electricity Ombudsman,
12, Srikrupa, Vijay Nagar,
Chhaoni, Nagpur-440 013
0712-2596670

