CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM;

MSEDCL NAGPUR (RURAL) ZONE NAGPUR **COMPLAINT NO. 51/2013**

Smt.Shantidevi Gopal Dandekar Datt mandir ward, opposite Bus stand, Nagpur road, 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
- Respondents represented by 1) Shri M.S. Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat.
 - 2) Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant 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 August, 2013)

2. Smt. Shantidevi Gopal Dandekar submitted this application on behalf of her deceased husband. It was contended that the electricity bill for the month of June, July 2011 was wrong and excessive. It was due to faulty meter. The applicant requested for correction in the bill. Initially she approached the IGRC Wardha. Her application was decided by an order passed under no.SE/Wardha/Tech/IGRC/2977 dated 21-05-2013. Feeling dissatisfied by the order, the applicant presented this application under the provision of Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & EO) Regulations 2006

- 3. A notice was issued to the respondent. The respondent submitted reply under no.EE/O&M/H'ghat/Tech/3792 dated 26-07-2013. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 07-08-2013. Shri B.V.Betal authorized representative, represented the applicant. Shri M.S.Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat and Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat were present for the respondent. Both the parties were heard.
- 4. Shri Betal contended that the applicant is a domestic consumer. There was no complaint whatsever about the power consumption of the applicant by the respondent. In the month of August 2011 the applicant was given a bill showing her consumption of 1136 units. The applicant immediately filed a complaint. She also deposited meter testing fee. The meter was replaced. However the old meter was not tested immediately. So also the bill issued on the basis of the defective reading was not corrected. So the respondents gave the subsequent bills showing the excess amount as an arrears. The respondents are levying the penal interest on the arrears. The respondents gave a copy of the test report with the letter dated 20-06-2013. The respondents admitted that the meter was faulty. The respondents changed the meter. However the new meter is also defective. It is running fast. So the applicant is not paying the electricity bill.

The applicant prayed that the new meter should be installed. The electricity bills for the period from August 2011 to July 2013 be issued on the basis of the consumption indicated by the new meter.

5. Shri Vaidya, Executive Engineer and Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer represented the respondents. The respondents referred to the written reply dated 26-07-2013. It was also stated that the applicant made a complaint about the bill of the month August 2011. The meter was replaced. However the data feeding of the new meter was done late. Subsequently the bills of the months August 2011, Sept.2011 and October 2011 were corrected. The revised bill was given to the applicant.

The old meter was sent to the testing department of the MSEDCL at Hinganghat. It was noticed that the meter was faulty. Since the meter was faulty the applicant has been given a provisional bill.

At the same time the applicant is not paying the electricity bills regularly. The applicant paid Rs.3000/- on 11-01-2012, Rs.5000/- on 21-08-2012, Rs.1000/- on 16-11-2012. So the applicant is a defaulter. If she did not pay the arrears her power supply will be discontinued.

It was also stated that the electricity meter installed at the residence of the applicant was replaced in August 2011. The applicant made a complaint about this new meter also. This new meter was checked on 24-06-2013. It was noticed that the new meter is working properly.

Furthermore the sanctioned load of the applicant is 0.20 kw. However it is noticed that the applicants consumption is of 4.30 kw. The bill is issued on the basis of this excess load factor.

The application has no force. It deserves to be dismissed.

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

The applicant was given a bill of 1136 units in the month August 2011. The meter was replaced in August 2011. The reading of new meter was taken after August 2011. Prior to August 2011 there was no complaint whatsoever from either of the parties. The meter reading shown prior and after August 2011 is as under,

Apr.11	May.11	Jun.11	Jul.11	Aug.11	Sept.11	Oct.11	Nov.11	Dec.11
43	26	304	144	1136	238	538	240	153

The reading is fluctuating. However her consumption was never 1136 units in one month. The respondents also noticed that the meter was faulty. Naturally the applicant entitle for relief. The respondents stated that they issued revised bill. The bill is for 3 months i.e. Aug 2011, Sept 2011, Oct 2011. Total consumption has been shown as 530 units and the bill is of Rs.2270/-. However the respondents committed two mistakes while issuing the bill. Firstly when the complaint was for the month of Aug 2011, the bill is issued for Aug 2011, Sept 2011 and Aug 2011. Secondly the respondent themselves admitted, Brl p vt by the extivity fot nschoj 0.20 kw vl w i k; {k ri kl .lh dyh vl rk rs4.38 kw vk<Gwvkysvkgso R; ki zk kp oht nsch fuxzhr dj.; kr vkyysvkgs The respondents have not quoted any provision in support of their aforesaid action. So the bill is liable to be set aside.

The applicant also made a complaint about the new meter. However the new meter is tested and it is found to be correct. Secondly the applicant has not submitted

any evidence in support of her afore said complaint. So we confirm that the new meter is working properly.

The respondent also stated that the applicant is not paying the electricity bills regularly. So she is liable for action. During the period Jan 2012 to Nov 2012 she made payment for three times only. In these circumstances the respondent may initiate action after following the due process of law.

In absence of cogent evidence we are inclined to accept other prayer of the applicant.

So we pass the following order,

ORDER

- i) Application No.51 of 2013 is partly allowed.
- ii) The bill for he months Aug.11, Sept.11 and Oct.11 of 530 units, is hereby set aside.
- iii) The respondent should issue a revised bill for the month of Aug 2011, as per the provision of Regulation 15.4.1. The respondent should not make any charge in the bill of the month Sept.2011 and Oct.2011.
- iv) The penalty and penal interest imposed against this bill amount is also set aside.
- v) Parties to bear their own cost.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/(Adv.Gauri D.Chandrayan) (Ms.S.B.Chiwande) (Vishnu S. Bute)

MEMBER MEMBER SECRETARY CHAIRMAN

CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM; NAGPUR ZONE NAGPUR

(Nagpur Dtd.12th day of August, 2013)

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

(O) 0712- 2022198

cgrfnz@gmail.com

NO. CGRF/NZ/ Date :

Certified copy of order dated 12th August,,2013 in Case No.51 / 2013 is enclosed herewith.

Member-Secy/ Exe.Engineer, C.G.R.F.(NZ)MSEDCL NAGPUR

To,

Smt.Shantidevi Gopal Dandekar, Datta mandir ward opposite Bus stand, Nagpur Raod, 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. The 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