

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/109/2015

Applicant : Shri Rajesh Ramlal Sahani,
Plot No.S/30, Chandranagar,
Pardi, Bhandara Road,
Nagpur : 400 008.

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 13.8.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 30.6.2015 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 his bills are excessive from August 2014. Therefore bills 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 13.7.2015. It is submitted that meter is tested in meter testing laboratory of SNDL in presence of the applicant and it is found correct. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

4. On the date of arguments, applicant was absent though called at several times, on three occasions i.e on 15.7.2015, 22.7.2015 and 29.7.2015. On 29.7.2015 applicant even did not file any adjournment application. Therefore arguments of non applicant were heard. Forum perused the record.

5. It is pertinent to note that name of the applicant is Rajesh Ramlal Sahani. One Shri Mahesh Sachdev presented this application before the Forum who on the date of presentation of the grievance told before the Forum that he is the purchaser of the house. Said Mahesh Sachdeva also admitted before the Forum that he filed grievance application in the name of consumer Rajesh R. Sahani and said Mahesh Sachdeva signed personally in the name of Rajesh R. Sahani. Therefore it is in fact a fraud. Mahesh Sachdeva has no right to file grievance application in the name of Rajesh R. Sahani without producing any authority on record. Furthermore, Shri Mahesh Sachdeva the purchaser can not fraudulently sign in

the name of Rajesh Sahani. Forum brought this aspect to the notice of Shri Mahesh Sachdeva and told him specifically on the date of presentation of the grievance that signing in the name of other is an offence under law and said purchaser Shri Mahesh Sachdeva has to rectify this mistake. Either he should produce authority letter of consumer Shri Rajesh Sahani showing that consumer has appointed Shri Mahesh Sachdeva as representative. He was also directed to produce fresh copy of the application duly signed by the consumer Shri Rajesh Sahani but thereafter Shri Mahesh Sachdeva disappeared and on three dates of hearing he did not rectify the grievance application by producing proper signature of the consumer on record.

6. Forum heard arguments of non applicant's side and perused record.

7. It is argued on behalf of SNDL that staff of SNDL went to the spot, took out the old meter, tested it in the laboratory and it is found O.K. New meter is installed. So far as second new meter is concerned, applicant did not permit to bring that meter for testing purpose and therefore second meter could not be tested due to fault of the applicant. It is further argued that it is a commercial connection. There is beer bar and restaurant etc. There is tremendous load as per spot inspection report. On behalf of SNDL it is argued that copy of the MRI report is produced on record and this copy shows that there must be theft of electricity energy.

8. We have carefully perused spot inspection report. It shows that there are 10 rooms, 10 fans, 20 CFL, 10 tube lights, 5

T.V., 5 set top box, 2 fridge, 1 motor, 4 A.Cs., 8 geezers. In remark column of spot inspection report i.e. column 10, it is specifically mentioned that meter is used for restaurant and it is further mentioned that load taken in the spot inspection report as per the say of the consumer and consumer did not allow to go inside. Therefore it is clear that there must be excessive load than load mentioned in the spot inspection report. That may be only the reason why consumer did not allow staff of SNDL to inspect the connected load. There are 8 geezers, 5 T.Vs and 10 fans. It means it may not be merely a restaurant but may be lodging also. MRI report also shows that possibility of theft of electricity can not be ruled out. However, non applicant did not produce any prima facie material on record to show that it is a theft of energy case.

9. Considering all these aspects in our opinion no relief can be given to the applicant. Bills can not be revised 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