

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/0010/2008

Applicant : Smt. Jenetrani Sunil Jecab
At Yishu House No. 640/B
Khalasi Lane,
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : MSEDCL represented by
the Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
Civil Lines Division NUZ,
Nagpur.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri S.D. Jahagirdar,
Chairman,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

2) Shri S.J. Bhargawa
Executive Engineer &
Member Secretary,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 25.02.2008)

This grievance application has been filed on 06.02.2008 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The grievance of the applicant is in respect of non-reflection of security deposit amount paid by her in her energy bills and in respect of erroneous recovery of cost of CFL bulbs despite the fact that the applicant never purchased any CFL bulbs.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed her first complaint application dated 13.05.2003 addressed to the Chief Engineer MSEB, NUZ, Nagpur informing him that security deposit amount paid by her at the time of release of connection is not being shown in her energy bills with a request to do the needful. By her second application dated 06.10.2007 addressed to the Superintending Engineer Nagpur Urban Circle, MSEDCL, Nagpur, she complained that although she did not purchase CFL bulbs, the cost thereof at the rate of 70/- per month is being recovered erroneously. She requested the Superintending Engineer to revoke such a recovery and give appropriate relief to her. No replies, whatsoever, were received by the applicant in response to her aforementioned applications.

The intimation given by the applicant to the Chief Engineer and Superintending Engineer in respect of the applicant's two grievances as aforesaid is deemed to the intimation given to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (in short, the Cell) in terms of the said Regulations and hence, the applicant was not required to approach the Cell again for redressal of her grievances before coming to this Forum.

The matter was heard on 22.02.2008.

The applicant's case was presented by her nominated representative one Shri Sunil Jecab while the Executive Engineer, Civil

Lines Division, NUZ, MSEDCL, Nagpur represented the non-applicant Company.

It is the contention of the applicant's representative that the amount of security deposit is not being shown in the applicant's energy bills since beginning despite the fact that she requested to that effect the various offices of MSEDCL. According to him, the applicant's connection was sanctioned and released in the year 2001 and that time, the applicant has paid security deposit amount of Rs.900/- before release of connection. This amount ought to have been shown in the applicant's energy bills but none of the applicant's energy bills has shown this amount of security deposit. This has happened inspite of the fact that the applicant has complained before the non-applicant way back on 13.05.2003 in this respect followed by her follow-up visits to various offices of then MSEDCL. In respect of the applicant's second grievance, the applicant's representative submitted that an amount of Rs.70/- per month is being recovered erroneously towards the cost of CFL bulbs though the applicant never purchased CFL bulbs. The applicant sent her application dated 06.10.2007 to the Superintending Engineer requesting him to look into this grievance and to grant appropriate relief but to no purpose.

According to the applicant's representative, the inaction on the part of the non-applicant Company has caused great hardships to the applicant. He, therefore, requested this Forum to award compensation to the applicant towards harassment of the applicant.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise report dated 20.02.2008 which is on record. The Executive Engineer signing this

report has stated that the applicant may be asked to furnish evidence to prove that she has deposited the security deposit amount.

In respect of the applicant's second grievance, the Executive Engineer has stated in this report that an amount of Rs.70/- per month is being recovered from the applicant in 10 equal installments towards cost of new meter since the applicant's old meter had burnt in March 2007. This recovery has no connection, whatsoever, with the cost of CFL bulbs.

During the course of hearing, the non-applicant has admitted that security deposit amount of Rs.900/- is already paid by the applicant in the year 2001 and new connection was released to her and also that this amount had remained to be shown in her energy bills inadvertently. He assured that the amount of security deposit will be shown in the applicant's ensuing energy bills along with appropriate amount of interest payable on this amount.

From the pleadings of both the parties, it is now clear that the applicant did pay security deposit amount of Rs.900/- in the year 2001. The earlier statement made in the parawise report of the non-applicant that the applicant should be asked to produce proof in respect of payment of security deposit amount is now withdrawn by the Executive Engineer representing the non-applicant company. Otherwise also, it is a matter of procedure that no new connection can be sanctioned and released to a consumer unless the consumer pays the security deposit amount. Since the non-applicant has admitted the shortcoming on the part of MSEDCL and assured that this amount shall be shown in the applicant's energy bills hereafter alongwith interest applicable, the first grievance of the applicant thus stands

redressed as per the applicant's request. No doubt that the non-applicant ought to have taken due cognizance on the applicant's application dated 13.05.2003 in this respect. However, the shortcoming on the part of MSEDCL now stands covered-up because of the assurance given by the Executive Engineer that the security deposit amount will be shown in the applicant's energy bills along with interest.

In respect of the applicant's second grievance, the non-applicant has clarified that the applicant's meter had burnt in March 2007 and the same was replaced by a new meter and further that the meter cost of Rs.700/- is being recovered from the applicant in 10 equal installments of Rs.70/- each from March 2007 to December 2007. The record also shows that the applicant's meter had burnt on 20.02.2007 and the burnt meter was replaced by a new meter bearing no. 122876 in March 2007. The non-applicant has also clarified that this cost of Rs.700/- is not at all related to the cost of CFL bulbs. He stated that CFL bulbs have not been provided by him nor purchased by the applicant. In this respect, the applicant's representative contended that the applicant's bill dated 14.02.2008 is still showing amount of Rs.1700/- as meter cost. The non-applicant thereupon replied that such an amount of Rs.1700/- as cost of meter has been shown erroneously in the applicant's energy bills and the ensuing energy bills of the applicant will not show such a recovery since since the last installment of Rs.70/- is already recovered from the applicant. In nutshell, since the applicant's meter had burnt, a new meter was installed and the applicant was rightly required to pay the meter cost thereof. This meter cost of Rs.700/- has already been recovered in 10 equal installments of

Rs.70/- between March 2007 to December 2007. It is also clear that this amount has no relation whatsoever with the cost of CFL bulbs. It would have been a good gesture on the part of the non-applicant had he clarified this position to the applicant in reply to the applicant's application dated 06.10.2007. The second grievance of the applicant is thus misconceived.

Looking to the nature of grievance and facts and circumstances of the case, this Forum holds a view that no compensation is payable to the applicant.

In the result, the applicant's application is partly allowed and it stands disposed off accordingly.

The non-applicant shall carryout this order and report compliance thereof to this Forum on or before 31.03.2008.

Sd/-
(S.J. Bhargawa)
Member-Secretary

Sd/-
(S.D. Jahagirdar)
CHAIRMAN

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD's
NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.**

Member-Secretary
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co.Ltd.,
Nagpur Urban Zone, NAGPUR.