Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nagpur Urban Zone, Nagpur Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/099/2015 Applicant Shri Jagdeo Pandurang Manohar, 202 Ratan Palaca, Canashnath 202 Ratan Palaca, Canashnath

- plicant Shri Jagdeo Pandurang Manohar, 203 Ratan Palace, Ganeshpeth, Near Agyaram Devi Chouk, S.T. Bus Stand Road, In front of Khurana Travels, Nagpur : 400 018.
- 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.

> <u>Quorum Present</u> : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman.

> > 2) Shri Anil Shrivastava, Member / Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 22.7.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 4.6.2015 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 bills and therefore bills may be revised. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. he approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dated 16.6.2015. It is submitted that meter is tested by Acucheck and found O.K. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. C.P.L. shows that there was average billing since April 2013 to February 2014 for a period of 11 months because there was Inaccessible / RNA / Meter Changed status respectively. Lastly meter was changed in February 2014 and there was actual billing in February 2014 for 11 months but there was no billing and billing was (-) 175.79. Record shows that since November 2014 applicant did not deposit any amount and enjoying the electricity free of cost for about 10 months.

6. We have carefully perused meter testing report (MMG) of SNDL. In remark column of test report there is specific note to the effect that there is earthing problem. It is the duty of consumer to maintain proper earthing. Therefore it is clear that as earthing is not proper complications were created and non applicant can not be held responsible for this problem. In February 2014 there is minus billing though there was average billing for the month from April 2013 to February 2014 and at the time of billing of February 2014 for 2206 units for 11 months amount of previous

billing is already deducted and credit of Rs. 11450/- is given in February 2014 to the applicant. Therefore no much relief can be granted to the applicant. On the contrary applicant has to maintain proper earthing. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence following order : -

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.
- 2) Applicant is directed to maintain proper earthing in accordance with law and regulations.

Sd/-(Anil Shrivastava) MEMBER / SECRETARY Sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil) CHAIRMAN