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

## Case No. CGRF(NZ)160/2016

Applicant : Shri Hindwardhan T.Jain

29, Bhange Vihar, Trimurtinagar

Nagpur-20.

Non-applicant: Nodal Officer,

The Executive Engineer,

O&M Dn., MSEDCL, Congresnagar

NAGPUR.

Applicant :- Absent.

Respondent by 1) Shri V.P.Mankar, AEE, Trimurtinagar S/Dn.

2) Shri S.K.Lokhande, AE, Trimurtinagar D/c.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,

Chairman.

2) Shri N.V.Bansod Member

3) Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member, Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_

## ORDER PASSED ON 18.10.2016.

- 1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 04.10.2016 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as said Regulations).
- Applicant's case in brief is that his energy bill for the month of May-2016 –
   1116 units is excessive and therefore it may be revised.

Page 1 of 4 Case No.160/2016

- 3. Non applicant, denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 17.10.2016. It is submitted that meter was tested by Accu-check meter and it is found O.K. Series meter was installed beside the said meter for consumption checking and in this checking also said meter was found O.K. Again meter was tested in the meter testing laboratory of MSEDCL Congresnagar Nagpur on 05-08-2016 and it is found O.K. Therefore bill can not be revised.
- 4. Applicant was absent though called at several times. Executive Engineer, O&M Division, MSEDCL, Congresnagar, Nagpur is also absent. Shri V.P.Mankar, Additional Executive Engineer, Trimurtinagar S/Dn. Nagpur was present and argued the matter for MSEDCL.
- 5. Forum heard arguments and perused record.
- 6. It is noteworthy that meter was tested in meter testing laboratory of MSEDCL Congresnagar Division Nagpur and as per meter testing report dated 05-08-2016 meter is found O.K. Furthermore according to MSEDCL series meter was installed beside the such meter for consumption checking and in this checking also meter was found O.K. Therefore it is clear that meter was O.K. Meter had correctly recorded the consumption as utilized by applicant.
- 7. There is spot inspection report dated 29-08-2016 on record. As per this spot inspection report there are 3 tube lights, 6 ceiling fans, 1 LED TV, 1 AC of 1.5 ton., 1 microwave oven, 1 cooler, 1 freeze of double door, 5 LED bulb. As per spot inspection report the connected load is 3660 W = 3.66 kW therefore there is sufficient connected load.
- 8. CPL shows that previously also in some months there was heavy

Page 2 of 4 Case No.160/2016

consumption. In June-2011 consumption was 804 units, in July-2012 – 885 units, in May-2012 – 665 units, in June-2013 – 811 units, in February-2013 – 704 units, in September-2013 – 746 units, in June-2014 – 994 units, in July-2014 – 947 units, in June-2015 – 236 units. Therefore in the same months there was heavy use of electricity and heavy consumption. Month of May-2016 is summer season. If electrical equipments of above detailed connected load are continuously used in the summer, it is but natural to have a consumption of 1116 units. After all consumption depends on the use of electricity.

- 9. Furthermore there may be any function like marriage at the house of the applicant and in that case also it is but natural to have more consumption.
- 10. It is noteworthy that today there are 2 cases of the applicant before this forum 1] present case No.160/2016 & 2] another case No.159/2016. In both these 2 cases 2 meters are installed in same house of the applicant i.e. one on ground floor and 2<sup>nd</sup> on 1<sup>st</sup> floor. In May-2016 consumption is 1116 units and case no.159/2016 in the same month May-2016 consumption is 1617 units. Therefore it is but natural that there must have been any function like marriage at the house of the applicant therefore only in both the cases and in both the meters in May-2016 consumption was 1116 units and 1617 units respectively in other case. Connected load in both the cases on 2 meters appears to be very excessive. In case No.159/2016 there are 3 A.Cs. & 2 Coolers and in the present case there is 1 A.C. & 1 Cooler.
- 11. Furthermore when there is such type of heavy connected load, there can not be very less consumption. However in this case in some of the months consumption is tremendously shown very less which is unbelievable. It is noteworthy that in May-2015 (Summer) consumption is shown 183 units, in June-2015 236 units, in

Page 3 of 4 Case No.160/2016

July-2015 – 178 units, in August-2016 – 160 units, in Sept-2016 – 140 units, in October-2015 - 155 units, in November-2015 – 144 units, in December-2015 – 126 units, in January-2016 – 109 units, in February-2016 – 123 units, in March-2016 – 181 units, in April-2016 -197 units, in June-2016 – 233 units, in July-2016 – 162 units, in May-2015 – 183 units. Therefore it is clear that such type of less consumption for said heavy connected load is impossible, therefore possibility of joining the hands with the meter reader can be rolled out. It is appears that though there was heavy connected load, meter reader was managed and fictitious entries were noted without correct meter reading. Therefore it is but natural that the consumption was accumulated in the meter. The meter reader must have been changed in May-2016 to whom applicant can't manage therefore accumulated reading was noted.

- 12. Even if it is noted that it is not the reading of accumulated consumption, even then if such type of several electrical equipments are continually utilized in (summer) May-2016, it is but natural to have more consumption.
- 13. Meter is tested in the meter testing laboratory of MSEDCL, Congresnagar Division, Nagpur and it is found O.K. Therefore consumption utilized by the applicant is correctly recorded by the meter. Therefore bill can not be revised.
- 14. Order passed by IGRC is legal and proper therefore needs no interference and grievance application deserve to be dismissed.
- 15. Hence the following order.

ORDER

Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-(N.V.Bansod) MEMBER

(Mrs.V.N.Parihar)
MEMBER/SECRETARY

sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil), CHAIRMAN Case No.160/2016