CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM;

MSEDCL NAGPUR (RURAL) ZONE NAGPUR COMPLAINT NO. 71/2013

Shri Hiralal Bhavarilal Bhagat Jagannath Ward, Hinganghat District - Wardha.

Complainant

,,VS..

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

Respondents

Applicant represented by
Respondents represented by
Shri B.V.Betal
Shri M.S.Vaidhya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat
Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat (U)

<u>CORAM:</u> Shri Vishnu S. Bute, Chairman. Adv. Gauri D. Chandrayan, Member Ms. S. B. Chiwande, Member-Secretary.

JUDGEMENT

(Delivered on this 19th day of September, 2013)

2. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied by the order passed by the IGRC Wardha under No.SE/Wardha/Tech/2507 dated 26-04-2013, Shri Hiralal Bhavarilal Bhagat (hereinafter referred to as, the applicant) has presented this grievance application. The applicant contended that the electricity meter installed at his residence was faulty. So he registered the complaint. He also deposited the testing fee. However the meter was not changed within the specified time. The applicant stated that the bills given to him thereafter are wrong. He approached the IGRC Wardha. His application was

dismissed by the aforesaid order. So he presented this grievance application under the provisions of Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF and E.O.) Regulations 2006.

3. A notice was given to the respondent MSEDCL. The respondent submitted parawise reply to the application under No.EE/O&M/H'ghat/Tech/4158 dated 17-08-2013. The case was fixed for personal hearing on 16-09-2013. Shri B.V.Betal, authorized representative was present for the applicant. Shri M.S.Vaidya, Executive Engineer, Hinganghat and Shri G.C.Chavan, Assistant Engineer, Hinganghat Urban represented the respondent. Both the parties were heard.

4. Shri Betal contended that the applicant got excess bill in the month of March, 2012. So he registered the complaint on 17-03-2012. He also deposited the testing fee Rs.100/- on 17-03-2012. However the respondent has not taken any action to test the meter. Thereafter one Shri Madame tested the meter by accucheck machine. He told that the meter was fast by 8%. After about 5 months the meter was changed. The applicant was insisting to test the meter in a testing lab. For that purpose only he deposited the testing fee. The meter was not tested. The applicant was not given any test report. The respondent changed the meter and the new meter was installed on 17-08-2012. Eventhereafter the applicant was getting the bills on average basis. The applicant deposited Rs.2500/- on 17-06-2012 and Rs.5000/- on 03-12-2012. Thereafter the respondent gave average bill of 328 units per month for the period from September, 2012 to January, 2013. The bill was wrong because the consumption of the applicant is meager. The bill given is not proper so it may be set aside. The bill may be given as per the actual reading of the new meter. At the same time the respondent also added

the interest amount and late fee. The respondent is insisting for payment of this amount. They are threatening the disconnection of the power supply. Since the total action taken by the respondent is wrong penal action against the concerned officers may be ordered.

5. The respondent referred to the written reply dated 17-08-2013. It was admitted that the applicant registered the complaint about excess billing. It was also admitted that the applicant deposited testing fee. It was further stated that initially the meter was tested by accucheck machine. Thereafter the meter was tested in testing lab. The respondent admitted that the meter was faulty. It was fast by 8.05%. So the applicant was given due credit for the period from April, 2012 to September, 2012. The credit of Rs.1397/- was given in the bill of the month of March, 2013. So the respondent took appropriate steps to rectify the grievance of the applicant. The respondent also stated that the applicant has not deposited any amount from 03-12-2012. So a notice for disconnection of supply has been given to the applicant. If the applicant fail to deposit the electricity charges his power supply shall be disconnected. The respondent also stated that the applicant is consuming more load than the sanctioned load.

6. We have perused the record. We have heard both the parties carefully. It is admitted position that the respondent received the complaint about the faulty meter in March, 2012. The applicant also deposited the testing fee on 17-03-2012. Naturally the respondents were duty bound to take action as per Regulation 14.4.3 and 14.4.4 of the supply code Regulations 2005. This was not done.

Two unattested Xerox copies of test report are placed on record. First report is dated 15-12-2012 and it show that the meter is fast by 1.06%. Second report is dated 04-03-2013 and it show that the meter is fast by 8.05%. The respondent also admitted in the written reply that the meter was faulty and it was fast by 8.05%.

The meter was changed and new meter was installed on 17-08-2012. On perusal of the CPL of the applicant it is seen that no action was taken to record the reading of the new meter upto January, 2013.

The respondent simply say that the credit of Rs.1397/- was given for the period from April, 2012 to September, 2012. However there is nothing on the record to show as to how the respondent calculated this amount. So the action can not be justified and it needs to be set aside.

The applicant registered the complaint. He also deposited the testing fee in March, 2012. The respondent also agree that the bills from April, 2012 needs to be corrected. So it will be proper if the respondent recalculate the bills as per provisions contained in Regulation 15.4.1 with effect from April, 2012 on basis of the actual reading of the meter after August, 2012.

The respondent should complete the exercise and inform the applicant, within one month, from the date of receipt of this order. The applicant should deposit the amount payable, if any. Till then the respondent should not disconnect the power supply. The respondent also raised the point about the sanctioned load etc. The point is totally irrelevant in this case. At the most the respondent may initiate separate action therefor.

7. In the facts and circumstances as discussed above we pass the following order,

<u>O R D E R</u>

- Application No.71 of 2013 is partly allowed. The respondent should calculate the bill as per the provision of 15.4.1 from March, 2012 till 17-08-2012, within one month from the date of receipt of this order.
- ii) The applicant should pay the electricity charges payable by him immediately.
- iii) The respondent should not disconnect the power supply till then
- iv) No order as to cost..

Sd/-Sd/-Sd/-(Adv.Gauri D.Chandrayan)(Ms.S.B.Chiwande)(Vishnu S. Bute)MEMBERMEMBER SECRETARYCHAIRMANCONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM; NAGPUR ZONE NAGPUR(Nagpur Dtd.19th day of September, 2013)

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM

NAGPUR ZONE (RURAL) M. S. E. D. C. L.

Plot No.12, Shrikrupa, Vijaynagar, Chhaoni,

<u>NAGPUR – 440013</u>

Email.id- <u>cgrfnz@mahadiscom.in</u> cgrfnz@gmail.com

(0) 0712- 2022198

NO. CGRF/NZ/

Date :

Certified copy of order dated 19th September,,2013 in Case No.71 / 2013

is enclosed herewith.

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

To,

Shri Hiralal Bhavarilal Bhagat, Jagannath Ward, 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