

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/174/2014

Applicant : Late Radhabai K. Khanwani,
Thr:- Shri Khushaldas Khanwani,
Plot No. 70, Kamal Matching Shop,
Jaripatka, Nagpur : 14.

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 22.8.2014.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 19.7.2014 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 connection of the applicant was residential but she was receiving the electricity bill as per commercial tariff. Therefore she complained to SNDL regarding change of tariff from commercial to residential. Applicant is running small tailoring shop in her residential premises and her consumption

is very less. Therefore she requested for revision of bill. Even then SNDL did not comply her grievance. She approached to I.G.R.C. and Learned I.G.R.C. passed order dated 25.3.2014 in Case No. 180/14 and directed to change the tariff from commercial to residential from billing month of August 2012 i.e. since 1.8.2012 and to give credit including interest in ensuing bill with residential tariff. Being aggrieved by the said order of Learned I.G.R.C. applicant approached to this Forum and claimed compensation of Rs. 10000/-.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 4.8.2014. It is submitted that as per order of Learned I.G.R.C. tariff is changed from commercial to residential and bill is already revised. Grievance application may be dismissed.

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

5. We have carefully perused order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. Dt. 25.3.2014 in Case No. 180/14. As per this order tariff of the applicant is changed from commercial to residential since 1.8.2012. and her bill is also revised. Now the applicant is claiming compensation of Rs. 10000/-. It is an admitted fact that in the same premises the applicant is running tailoring shop in front portion and applicant is residing in back portion of the house. Apparently, at the time of meter reading or spot inspection it is but natural that the concerned officers of SNDL noticed the tailoring shop of the applicant in the front portion of the house and that may be the reason why commercial tariff was applied instead of residential tariff. Order of Learned I.G.R.C. shows that bills are directed to be revised since

1.8.2012. Therefore record shows that this bonafide mistake of commercial tariff is continued since 1.8.2012. However, there is nothing on record to show that since 1.8.2012 applicant any time approached to SNDL about application of wrong tariff for a period of 2 years. For the first time the applicant filed grievance application to I.G.R.C. on 1.3.2014. It was also the duty of the applicant to bring this fact about application of wrong tariff as early as possible since 1.8.2012 but applicant was silent for a long time.

6. As earlier pointed out, tailoring shop is situated admittedly in front portion of the house of the applicant and hence it was nothing but bonafide mistake of SNDL that they have mentioned commercial tariff instead of residential. Secondly, now commercial tariff is already changed into residential. Not only this, bill is revised w.e.f. 1.8.2012 on prorata basis and credit including interest is given in ensuing bill with residential tariff. Therefore sufficient relief is already granted to applicant. In our considered opinion, in such type of cases, no compensation can be granted. In fact, no loss is caused to the applicant. Credit is given including interest also. Therefore we hold that applicant is not entitled for any compensation and grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence following order:-

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Anil Shrivastava)
MEMBER
SECRETARY

Sd/-
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shivajirao S. Patil),
CHAIRMAN