

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/088/2015

Applicant : Shri Sk. Shahzad Sk. Karim,
Bhaldarpura, Vidarbha
Premier Society,
Nagpur.

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

Applicant :- In person.

Respondent by 1) Shri Rody, Nodal Office.
2) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL Nagpur.

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

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar
Member.

3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,
Member / Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 11.6.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 30.4.2015 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as said Regulations).

2. Applicant's case in brief is that he received excessive bill. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C., he approached to this Forum and claimed to revise the bill.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dated 11.5.2015. It is submitted that meter is tested in meter testing laboratory and it is found correct. Therefore bill can not be revised. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. Date of connection is recent i.e. on 9.1.2015. In January 2015 there was RNA Status and there was average billing of 73 units. In February 2015 reading is 801 units for 2 months. In March 2015, consumption is 535 units. We have carefully perused spot inspection report. We have also verified the connected load from the applicant during the course of hearing. Forum found that applicant is concealing the truth so far as connected load is concerned. Applicant later on admitted that his house is double storied building. There are 3 rooms on ground floor and 3 rooms on first floor. Thus total there are 6 rooms. It is noteworthy that in the middle part of spot inspection report, there is specific note to the effect that "First floor used for bed room and for this purpose there is separate meter but this fact orally told by the consumer and consumer had not shown separate meter, at the time of spot inspection". There is nothing on record to show that there are separate meters in the premises. Applicant had not mentioned this fact either before I.G.R.C. or before this Forum.

6. No electricity bill of other meter is produced. During the course of hearing, when Forum verified about this fact, applicant was changing version from time to time and was concealing the facts so far as number of rooms and connected load is concerned. It is crystal clear from the language of spot inspection report that detail particulars mentioned in spot inspection report are noted on the say of the applicant and not as per available situation. In spot inspection report, it is mentioned that 2 fans, 1 bulb, 3 tube lights, 1 TV, 1 cooler. It is impossible that though there are six rooms there is such type of less connected load. At the bottom of spot inspection report, again there is another note to the effect that “meter used for ground floor only as per the say of the consumer”. Therefore it is clear that the person who inspected the spot believed the words of the applicant and prepared this spot inspection report. Therefore no reliance can be placed on such type of spot inspection report.

7. Meter is already tested in meter testing laboratory and it is found correct. Therefore consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilized by the applicant.

8. We find no force in the grievance application and 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