

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/257/2014**

Applicant : Smt. Malti Virendrakumar Mali,  
Plot No. 188, Deorup Bhavan,  
Jaripatka Ring Road,  
Nagpur : 14.

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

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,  
Chairman.  
  
2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar  
Member.  
  
3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,  
Member / Secretary.

**ORDER PASSED ON 27.11.2014.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 16.10.2014 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 since July 2014, she is receiving excessive bills. There is very less connected load. Meter is

tested but it is found O.K. Consumption of last one year be considered and bill be revised.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 27.10.2014. It is submitted that meter was tested by acucheck on 10.9.2014 and it is found O.K. As per order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. meter is changed, new meter is installed and old meter is tested in meter testing laboratory on 4.10.2014 and it is found O.K. Therefore bill can not be revised. Grievance application be dismissed.

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

5. Applicant runs a shop of battery charging in this premises. It is commercial connection. In spot inspection report sufficient connected load is shown. There is 1 fan, 1 CFL, 4 tube lights & 2 battery chargers. Needless to say that so far as charging of battery and utilization of energy is concerned, it depends on flow of consumers. If there is heavy business, there may be more consumption than low business. Therefore it is fluctuating as per the available situation.

6. We have perused consumption trend of the applicant. Till July 2014, it was below 100 units maximum. Only in the month of August 2014 consumption was 129 units and in September 2014 consumption was 162 units. Therefore it is not excessive consumption. Due to heavy business, it is possible to have used more energy.

7. It is very strange that since July 2012 very less consumption is appearing. In January 2012, February 2012, March 2012 & April 2012

'0' units per month, in May 2012 '2' units, in June 2012 only '1' unit, in July 2012 '2' units, August 2012 '10' units, September 2012 '7' units, October 2012 '4' units, November 2012 '5' units, December 2012 '0' units, January 2013 '2' units, February 2013 '4' units. Therefore it appears that there is something manipulation by the consumer during this period by joining hands with distribution licensee. When alleged conspiracy could not succeed in further period, therefore reasonable, normal and believable consumption is appearing in further period. It appears that applicant has compared this real consumption with earlier manipulated consumption '0' or '1' unit. Therefore she felt it excessive. It is impossible to have '0', '1', '2' or '4' units consumption considering sufficient connected load.

8. Meter is tested in meter testing laboratory on 4.10.2014 and it is found O.K. Therefore bill can not be revised. 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