

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/195/2014

Applicant : Smt. Ruhina Tabassum Baig,
Plot No. 18, Jafar Nagar,
Nagpur.

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

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,
Chairman.

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar
Member.

3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,
Member / Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 7.10.2014.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 12.8.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. The applicant's case in brief is that applicant is receiving excessive bills and therefore bills be revised. Her grievance application is rejected by I.G.R.C. Therefore she approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 23.8.2014. Meter is tested by acucheck on 16.6.2014 and it is found O.K. Grievance application may be dismissed.
4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused record.
5. Spot inspection report shows that there is tremendous heavy connected load of the applicant. Applicant's building is double storied building having total $7 + 7 = 14$ rooms, there are 9 fans, 7 tube lights, 3 CFLs, one T.V., 1 set top box, 1 freeze, 1 cooler, 1 motor pump, 2 ACs, 1 washing machine and 1 computer. Considering this much connected load, in our opinion, there is no scope of revision of bill.
6. It is noteworthy that there is spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 on record and it was the only one spot inspection report till the date of hearing on 26.8.2014. During the course of arguments, this spot inspection report was scrutinized by the Forum and it was found that it is not signed by the consumer. At that time consumer told that he signed spot inspection report and as a proof thereof, the applicant had shown photo of this spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 on her/his mobile screen. We have carefully perused that photo of spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 on mobile screen of the applicant. It was duly signed by the applicant mentioning her/his mobile number under the signature. But it is strange that spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 is not signed by the applicant. It seems that employee of SNDL Shri M.S. Shukla has manipulated and changed the spot inspection report. This fact is also

proved by other circumstances. In spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 the applicant had shown 9 rooms, 8 fans, 10 CFLs, 2 tube lights, 1 T.V., 1 set top box, 1 freeze, 1 motor pump, 1 mixer, 1 A.C. and 1 washing machine. When we verified these contents, applicant told that this load is incorrectly shown and the report is also not signed by her/him. Therefore original spot inspection report is replaced by Shri M.S. Shukla. It is also note worthy that in Column No. 10 of spot inspection report Shri M.S. Shukla employee of SNDL has written specific note "as per discussions with the consumer only first floor in use. Ground floor vacant from long time". This note is unwarranted so far as spot inspection report is concerned. During the course of arguments, applicant told that there are 7 rooms on first floor and 7 rooms on ground floor and he told different connected load. Therefore it is nothing but clear cut perjury committed by the employee of SNDL. During the course of arguments Forum put specific query to Shri Dahasahasra employee of SNDL who argued the matter and told him what is going on if such types of documents are changed? It is rather surprising to note that Shri M.S. Shukla employee of SNDL must have got information of these facts from any source and as a height of it, same employee of SNDL Shri M.S. Shukla produced on record another spot inspection report after the date of hearing Dt. 26.8.2014 but wisely shown and mentioned date of spot inspection report as 25.8.2014. Moreover, though this spot inspection report is dated 25.8.2014 it is filed on record on 1.9.2014. There were no directions from the Forum even then after hearing and before judgement, another spot inspection report Dt. 25.8.2014 signed by same Shri M.S. Shukla employee of SNDL is produced on record and this subsequent report is duly signed by the consumer also.

7. We have carefully perused first spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 and another spot inspection report Dt. 25.8.2014. There is complete variance and change in contents of both these reports. Therefore same signatory employee of SNDL Shri M.S. Shukla produced 2 different spot inspection report on record showing different rooms and different loads. In earlier spot inspection report, rooms are shown 9, but in another spot inspection report, rooms are shown as 7. In fact rooms are $7 + 7 = 14$. In first inspection report, 8 fans are shown; in subsequent report 9 fans are shown, in first inspection report 10 CFL, in subsequent report 3 CFL. Therefore it is crystal clear that Shri M.S. Shukla, employee of SNDL had prepared first spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 or another spot inspection report Dt. 25.8.2014. One and same signatory can not prepare 2 different reports having different contents. This cleverness of Shri M.S. Shukla of producing subsequent report Dt. 25.8.2014 had himself tied him with his own wrong and no more evidence is required to prove that he has manipulated the inspection report. Such a serious tendency needs serious action.

8. We have carefully perused CFL. It is true that in June 2014, reading is shown 2466 units but it is the reading for 3 months. In April 2014 & May 2014 status is Inaccessible. Therefore reading of June 2014 is for 3 months. Credit of Rs. 7576.27 & 36.49 is already given to the applicant in June 2014. There is sufficient load. On ground floor, there are 7 rooms and on first floor, there are 7 rooms. Thus total rooms are 14. There are 9 fans, 7 tube lights, 3 CFL, 1 TV, 1 set top box, 1 freeze, 1 cooler, 1 motor pump, 2 A.Cs., 1 washing machine and 1 computer. There

fore there is tremendous load. It appears that it is the load only in either 7 rooms or in 9 rooms. Shri M.S. Shukla had not counted the entire load in total 14 rooms (7 rooms on Ground floor and 7 rooms on first floor). It is possible that in other rooms also there is sufficient load and electrical equipments but Shri M.S. Shukla, employee of SNDL had wisely noted in Column No. 10 i.e. remarks column of spot inspection that as per discussions with the consumer only first floor is in use and ground floor is vacant since long. Therefore it is the load only on first floor and load on ground floor in 7 rooms appears to be suppressed. In fact, Shri M.S. Shukla should have counted entire load in complete building including ground floor but he avoided it and wrote remark that ground floor is vacant. It is suspicious. It is not the duty of employee of SNDL whether any room is vacant or is in use. Employee who takes inspection of spot has to take load of all rooms and all electrical equipment but Shri M.S. Shukla avoided it for the reasons best known to him. Month of June was peak summer season in 2014 and therefore it is but natural that there was heavy consumption.

9. It is note worthy that as per order dated 26.8.2014, it was ordered to test the meter in the laboratory of M.S.E.D.C.L. and to produce the report on record. Executive Engineer, Testing (U) Division, M.S.E.D.C.L. Nagpur filed testing report on record Dt. 16.9.2014 and as per this report meter is O.K. Therefore consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilised by the applicant and there is no scope for any variance.

10. Considering the record, in our opinion there is no scope for revision of any bill and application deserves to be dismissed. Hence following order: -

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.
- 2) Business manager of SNDL is hereby directed to take suitable action in accordance with law against Shri M.S. Shukla, employee of SNDL for preparation of 2 different and contradictory spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 and 25.8.2014 and for suppressing original spot inspection report Dt. 18.7.2014 which was duly signed by the applicant as shown on her mobile screen.
- 3) Compliance should be reported within 30 days from the date of this order.

Sd/-
(Anil Shrivastava)
MEMBER
SECRETARY

Sd/-
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shivajirao S. Patil),
CHAIRMAN