## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/293/2014

Applicant	<ul> <li>Shri Manoharrao Waghmare, User Ashish Waghmare, Plot No. 59, Uday Nagar, Nagpur.</li> </ul>

- Non–applicant : Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee), MSEDCL, NAGPUR.
- <u>Quorum Present</u> : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman.
  - 2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar Member.
  - 3) Shri Anil Shrivastava, Member / Secretary.

## ORDER PASSED ON 16.1.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 18.11.2014 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 he received excessive bill of Rs. 7842.20 for the month of February 2011. Therefore he requested to revise the bill. His grievance application is dismissed by I.G.R.C. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. Dt. 11.11.2014 he approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 4.12.2014. It is submitted that for the first time applicant complained before Learned I.G.R.C. on 22.10.2014 that bill for February 2011 amounting to Rs. 7704.68 is excessive. It was barred by limitation and therefore his grievance application is rejected by Learned I.G.R.C.

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

5. During the midnight of 30.4.2011, M.S.E.D.C.L. handed the work of Distribution Franchisee M/s. S.N.D.L. As per CPL of the applicant, his meter was shown faulty in February 2011 with consumption '1' unit but at the same time had included adjustment of Rs. 7704.68 was raised in the bill thus making the total amount of Rs. 7842.20 and since then this amount is shown as arrears recoverable continuously in his bill.

6. Now, since the bill of February 2011 was issued by the authority of M.S.E.D.C.L. much before Franchisee has taken over the electricity distribution work i.e. on 1.5.2011, therefore M/s. SNDL has definitely no jurisdiction to revise the bill of 2011. There is nothing on record to show that since February 2011 till today the applicant approached to M.S.E.D.C.L. or I.G.R.C. of M.S.E.D.C.L. to revise the bill of February 2011 within a period of 2 years from the date when cause of action has arisen. Admittedly for the first time applicant filed grievance application to I.G.R.C. of SNDL on 22.10.2014. According to Regulation 6.6 of the said regulations, Forum shall not admit any Page 2 of 3

grievance unless it is filed within 2 years from the date on which cause of action has arisen. Therefore grievance application is barred by limitation and deserves to be dismissed.

7. Order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. is legal and proper and needs no interference. From all angles, Forum is of considered opinion that 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