

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/117/2015**

Applicant : Shri Bhagwan M. Chankapure,  
Plot No. 80/81, Nirmal Colony,  
Nara Road,  
Jaripatka,  
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 11.9.2015.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 16.7.2015 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 on 14.2.2015, 15.2.2015, 1.3.2015, 11.3.2015, 14.3.2015, 15.3.2015, 17.3.2015, 24.3.2015, 9.4.2015 & 11.4.2015, his electricity supply was interrupted without any prior notice by SNDL. Applicant complained to call center of SNDL bearing No. 07126660000. In spite of several complaints employees of SNDL did not attend the complaint calls, nor restored the supply and therefore applicant had alternative than to reside in darkness. On 1.3.2015 at about 3.00 a.m. during night supply was interrupted and it was restored on the same day in the evening at 7.30 hrs. Applicant complained regarding the same. But employees of SNDL did not attend the call. There was interruption of electricity supply for more than 15 hours. In support of his contention applicant produced bill of Vodafone mobile company details of phone calls of the applicant are appearing. Similarly, on 14.3.2015, supply was interrupted on 1.00 during the night and it was restored on the next morning at 11.30 a.m. Since 1.00 a.m. in the night applicant gave about 10 telephone calls to SNDL but there was no response and applicant remained in darkness for more than 10 hours. Due to interruption in electricity supply many a times applicant had to remain in darkness and suffered unnecessary harassment, mental torture and nuisance. Further more whenever applicant called on call center of SNDL always telephone lines were busy and applicant had to try again and again by his mobile phone. Applicant had to wait to connect telephone call for about 30 minutes

and in such circumstances applicant had to pay excessive telephone bill unnecessarily.

3. Applicant further submitted that he filed an application Dt. 12.6.2015 to SNDL and obtained acknowledgement but SNDL falsely alleged about receipt of complaint of applicant on 26.6.2015. It is bold false of SNDL that supply was interrupted merely on 2 days i.e. on 15.2.2015 and 1.3.2015. First date of interruption of supply was 14.2.2015. At that time applicant himself gave telephone call on call center of SNDL during the night at 2.07 a.m. In support of his contention applicant had produced bill of Vodafone Company in which it is specifically mentioned that phone call was going on for about 4 minutes 44 seconds. Bill of mobile of the applicant is at Annexure 'A'. Applicant approached to I.G.R.C. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. applicant approached to this Forum and claimed compensation as per MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014.

4. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dated 4.8.2015. It is submitted that applicant simply complained twice regarding interruption of electricity supply. For the first time applicant complained on 15.2.2015 at 12.58 p.m. and this complaint was duly attended and complied at 21.15 p.m. Therefore there was delay of 8 hrs. 15 minutes. According to MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014, such complaint has to be attended with in six hours but there was delay of 2 hrs. 15 minutes. Another

complaint of the applicant was Dt. 1.3.2015 at 12.40 p.m. It was attended at 13.30 p.m. within 50 minutes and therefore within stipulated time as per MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014. Therefore Learned I.G.R.C. granted compensation @ 50/- per hour amounting to Rs. 150/- as per order dated 30.6.2015. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. Needless to say that there is well known call center of SNDL being the facility to consumers at large to complain about interruption in electricity supply and call center number of SNDL is 07126660000. All the consumers who are within the jurisdiction of SNDL have noted this call center number and in case of interruption of supply, aggrieved consumer immediately complains on said call center number. It is bounden duty of SNDL being Distribution Franchisee of Distribution Licensee to attend such complaint and to give prompt service to the consumer within stipulated time as per MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014.

7. Now we have to consider on what dates applicant really complained on said call center number and this fact is evident from mobile bills of Vodafone Company produced by the applicant along with grievance application vide Annexure 'A'. In this mobile bill of Vodafone Company, applicant had highlighted all these relevant

dates of interruption of supply which are described in grievance application in detail. All these dates of interruption of electricity supply given in the grievance application are specifically appearing along with time of giving mobile calls on call center No. 07126660000. Therefore these mobile bills of the applicant had provided beyond any shadow of doubt that all the dates of interruption of electricity supply given in the applicant are true and correct. A man may lie but not the documents. Mobile bill of the applicant is issued by Vodafone Company and it is not self created evidence at any cost. No consumer will phone call center of SNDL during mid night by his mobile unnecessarily unless and until his electricity supply is interrupted at midnight. Therefore we find no force in the contention of SNDL that only on 2 occasions there was complaint by the applicant.

8. As we have already pointed out supply of the applicant was interrupted on all given dates described in the grievance application. SNDL had given reply regarding restoration of electricity supply only on 2 occasions Dt. 15.2.2015 and 1.3.2015. SNDL had not given any reply regarding attending other calls and restoration of supply so far as other dates given in the application are concerned. Therefore we have no other alternative but to believe contention of the applicant described in the application that on particular dates there was delay in attending the complaint for restoration of supply. Therefore we hold that grievance application of the applicant is genuine, proper and legal.

9. Further more, if such type of interruption in electricity supply is caused again and again specially due to negligence of SNDL consumer has unnecessarily to utilise his mobile even at mid night to call the call center of SNDL. It is also but natural that thousands of consumers in big Nagpur City, within the jurisdiction of SNDL have to utilize same call center number of SNDL 07126660000 and therefore it is but natural that applicant found telephone lines busy every time and has to call again and again even during the night and thereby there is increase in telephone bill of the applicant unnecessarily.

10. Further more, applicant is employed person working in the office and residing with family members. Therefore due to interruption of electricity supply specially during mid night, definitely harassment and inconvenience was caused to the applicant and his family members repeatedly at several times and there was mental torture and physical harassment. Therefore in our opinion applicant is entitled for compensation regarding the delay in attending FOC of the applicant on all dates described in the grievance application and therefore applicant is entitled for compensation as per MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014 for the delay described in the grievance application.

11. Order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. is not correct and proper. Learned I.G.R.C. ought to have considered these aspects of the matter. Therefore it is necessary to set aside and cancel order

passed by Learned I.G.R.C. Dt. 30.6.2015 in case No. 444/15. Hence following order :-

### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application allowed.
- 2) Non applicant is hereby directed to pay compensation to the applicant for not attending of Fuse off Call complaints of the applicant and for non restoration of electricity supply in the stipulated time, according to MERC (Standard of Performance, Period for giving Supply and determination of Compensation) Regulations 2014 for the delay described in the application.
- 3) Non applicant is also directed to pay compensation of Rs. 2000/- to the applicant for harassment and mental torture.
- 4) Compliance should be reported within 30 days from the date of this order.

Sd/-  
(Anil Shrivastava)  
MEMBER  
SECRETARY

Sd/-  
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
(Shivajirao S. Patil),  
CHAIRMAN