

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/101/2012

Applicant : Shri Giridhar R. Laddha,
4 A, Wathoda Ring Road,
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 20.11.2012.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on Dt. 25.9.2012 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 the applicant has industrial power connection with connected load of 17 kW and demand of 14 kVA. Till mid of March 2011, supply to the applicant was given through meter No. 7197922. In the middle of March 2011, this meter got burnt and was replaced

by Meter No. 0937872. Till November 2011 the applicant received the bills of '0' consumption. In the bill for December 2011, the applicant received a bill of Rs. 55630/- showing initial reading as '1' and final reading as 9981 units. The applicant did not pay this bill and contacted officers of M/s. SPANCO and requested to rectify it. In the month of April 2012, Officers of M/s. SPANCO came to the spot to disconnect the power supply due to non-payment of arrears without notice. The applicant requested to allow to pay current bill pending disputed bill but M/s. SPANCO did not agree and asked the applicant to pay 50% of bill amounting to Rs. 34,995/-. This amount was paid by the applicant on 27.4.2012. The applicant applied to I.G.R.C. I.G.R.C. rejected the grievance application of the applicant and therefore the applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied the applicant's case by filing reply dated 16.10.2012. It is submitted that in March 2011, Meter No. 53/7197922 was burnt. Therefore M.S.E.D.C.L. had installed another meter No. 55/09378727. Since March 2011 to November 2011 bills for '0' unit per month were issued. M.S.E.D.C.L. did not submit the meter replacement report and therefore in December 2011 initial reading was shown '0' and bill of 9981 units was issued. The consumer objected for this bill and requested for revision. In April 2012 the applicant deposited 50% amount of Rs. 34,995/- on 27.4.2012. I.G.R.C. has rejected the grievance application of the applicant. As per

letter of M.S.E.D.C.L. Dt. 29.8.2012, Meter No. 55/09378727 was previously allotted to Shri Bhupinder Jethalal and it was disconnected at final reading 3151.

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

5. As per the letter of M.S.E.D.C.L. Dt. 29.8.2012 this meter was previously allotted to one Shri Bhupinder Jethalal and at the time of permanent disconnection, final reading was 3151. Same meter was installed at the premises of the applicant. Therefore it is clear that initial reading of the applicant was 3151.

6. On behalf of the applicant it is argued that meter was removed from the premises of the previous consumer in August 2010 and installed in the premises of the applicant in March 2011. In absence of any documents it can not be conclusively established that the meter was not installed anywhere else during the intervening period. On the contrary on behalf of M.S.E.D.C.L. it is argued that after permanent disconnection of Shri Bhupinder Jethalal meter was not installed at any other place and as per record it was installed at the premises of the applicant only.

7. There is nothing on record to show that after permanent disconnection of Shri Bhupinder Jethalal, meter was allotted to any other person than the applicant. Merely

because permanent disconnection of Shri Bhupinder Jethalal was in August 2010 and merely because same meter was installed in the premises of the applicant in March 2011, it can not be said that meanwhile the meter was installed at any other place. There is no such record available anywhere to show that in the meanwhile meter was utilized by any body else. Therefore we find no force in the argument of the applicants side that meter was installed anywhere else during the intervening period of August 2010 to March 2011. This suspicion of the applicant has absolutely no base. The applicant also did not produce any evidence on record to show that in the mean while period since August 2010 to March 2011, this meter was allotted to any other person. The applicant collected the information from various sources and simply could prove that previously same meter was installed at the premises of Shri Bhupinder Jethalal. But the applicant did not produce any documents on record to show that same meter was allotted to any other person before allotting to the applicant. Therefore it is clear that initial reading of the applicant was 3151. Considering the initial reading of the applicant as 3151, it is necessary to revise the disputed bill. This much relief only can be granted to the applicant. In our opinion the applicant is not entitled for any compensation. The applicant even did not pay complete bill but paid only 50% bill and his supply was continued. There was absolutely no harassment and damage to the applicant and therefore no compensation can be granted. Hence Forum proceeds to pass the following order :-

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) Non applicant is hereby directed to consider initial reading of the applicant as 3151 and considering so, to revise disputed bills of the applicant.
- 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