

**Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s  
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum  
Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur**

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/98/2012**

Applicant : Shri Manilal B. Katariya,  
Thr:- Vinay Gulabchand Jain,  
Near Amardeep Talkies, Ladpura,  
Itwari,  
NAGPUR.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,  
The Superintending Engineer,  
(Distribution Franchisee),  
N.U.C., MSEDCL, NAGPUR.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri. Shivajirao S. Patil  
Chairman,  
  
2) Smt. Kavita K. Gharat  
Member Secretary.

**ORDER PASSED ON 9.11.2012.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on Dt. 18.9.2012 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. Applicant's case in brief is that in the month of April 2011, the applicant received electricity bill of 1181 units. It was excessive. He complained about the said excessive bill. Jr. Engineer, Shri Ranade advised him for testing of the

meter. The applicant deposited testing amount of Rs. 500/- on 26.4.2011. Said meter was taken to laboratory for testing purpose and new meter was installed. Meanwhile, MSEDCL handed over the work to its Franchisee M/s. SPANCO. At the time of installation of the meter applicant saw initial reading 747 but on the bill initial reading was shown '1'. In spite of repeated demands no relief is granted to the applicant. Therefore the applicant filed present grievance application and requested to revise the bill of April 2011.

3. Non applicant denied the applicant's case by filing reply dated 10.10.2012. It is submitted that bill for April 2011 of 1181 units was correct but the applicant complained about the said bill and deposited Rs. 500/- testing charges on 26.4.2011. Old meter was replaced and new meter was installed. As per the record initial reading of the meter was 510. Considering the said initial reading revised bill will be issued to the applicant.

4. Forum heard arguments of both the parties and perused the record.

5. There is nothing on record to show that the meter was tested. We have carefully perused CPL of the consumer. His monthly consumption appears to be near about 400 to 500 units per month and it was never even up to 1000 units. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and available material on record, in our opinion it is necessary in

the interest of justice to revise the bill of April 2011 considering the initial reading as 510. Hence Forum proceeds to pass the following order :-

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) Non applicant is hereby directed to correct the bill of the applicant for April 2011 considering the previous average of one year so also to consider the initial reading '510'.
- 3) All Other reliefs claimed by the applicant are hereby dismissed.
- 4) Non applicant to comply within 30 days from the date of this order.

Sd/-  
(Smt.K.K.Gharat)  
MEMBER  
SECRETARY

Sd/-  
(ShriShivajirao S.Patil)  
CHAIRMAN