

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/111/2013**

Applicant : Smt. Annapurna G.Patil,  
Plot No. 270, Indora Chouk, Gond  
Mohalla,  
NAGPUR : 440 004.

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

Quorum Present : 1) Shri. Shivajirao S. Patil  
Chairman,  
  
2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar,  
Member,  
  
3) Shri B.A. Wasnik,  
Member Secretary.

**ORDER PASSED ON 25.7.2013.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 28.6.2013 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 applicants' case in brief is that the applicant is receiving excessive bills. Therefore his bills may be revised and meter be tested in the laboratory of M.S.E.D.C.L.

3. Non applicant M/s. SPANCO denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 16.7.2013. It is submitted that meter of the applicant is tested on 14.5.2013 and it is found O.K. Therefore needs no revision. In the bill of June 2013, there are arrears of Rs. 8805.96 and total bill is amounting to Rs. 13137.88. Directions may be given to pay the bill.

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

5. We have carefully perused the meter testing report Dt. 14.5.2013. It shows that meter of the applicant is O.K. It is note worthy that it is in fact old meter of the applicant which is electromagnetic meter and it is not new electronic meter. Therefore in fact the applicant shall be thankful to M/s. SPANCO that up till now his old electromagnetic meter is not changed like other consumers.

6. We have carefully perused entries in CPL and specifically the consumption trend of the applicant. Considering the load of the applicant it is absolutely not excessive. It appears that in the month of April 2013, there was consumption of 728 units and that may be the reason why the applicant suspects about correctness of the meter. However, it is noteworthy that bill of April 2013 is not only for one month but period of his billing month is since 8.3.2013 to 20.4.2013. It means it is the bill for 1 month and 12 days. Further more, during the course of hearing the applicant frankly admitted that it was the summer period and applicant used two additional coolers during this billing period.

Therefore it is but natural that due to this excessive consumption for summer season and one month 12 days billing period, consumption is 728 units in April 2013, but the meter is absolutely not faulty. Non applicant also produced spot inspection report on record regarding connected load which shows following connected load :-

i)	Fan	-	4
ii)	Tube Lights-		4
iii)	T.V.	-	1
iv)	Refrigerator-		1
v)	CFL	-	4
vi)	P.C.	-	1
vii)	Mixer	-	2

7. The applicant admitted during the course of hearing that he had 2 coolers. Considering this connected load and trend of consumption of the applicant, in our considered opinion, meter is O.K. and billing is proper. Therefore consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilized by the applicant and therefore there is no need to test the meter of the applicant again and to revise the bills. Hence the following order :-

### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-  
(Shri B.A. Wasnik)  
MEMBER  
SECRETARY

Sd/-  
(Adv.Subhash Jichkar)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(ShriShivajirao S.Patil)  
CHAIRMAN