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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/280/2014

Applicant : Shri T.N. Naidu,

Photographer, Mayo Hospital Road,

Hansapuri, Nagpur:440 018.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,

The Superintending Engineer,

(Distribution Franchisee),

MSEDCL, NAGPUR.

Quorum Present

: 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,

Chairman.

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar

Member.

3) Shri Anil Shrivastava, Member / Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 5.1.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 10.11.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

Page 1 of 3 Case No. 280/14

- 2. The applicant's case in brief is that he received excessive electricity bills. Therefore said bills may be revised.
- 3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 24.11.2014. It is submitted that meter of the applicant was tested by acucheck on 17.10.2014 and it is found O.K. As per order of Learned I.G.R.C. meter is tested in the laboratory in presence of the applicant and it is found O.K. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.
- 4. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused the record.
- 5. It is a residential connection. Applicant argued that his bill for September 2014 is 1159 units. On 7.9.2014 at 8.30, there was thunderstorm along with lightening due to which T.V. set of many persons were burnt and therefore applicant apprehend that meter was jumped. However, so far as jumping of the meter due to thunderstorm or lightening is concerned, we do not agree with this argument of the applicant, because if really there would have been any effect of thunderstorm or lightening on the meter, the meter would have been burnt itself and not merely jumped. However, it is an admitted fact that meter was not burnt and even the meter was not damaged also. Meter is tested in the laboratory of SNDL and as per testing report Dt. 10.11.2014 meter is found O.K. Therefore it is our considered opinion that there was no jumping of the meter due to alleged thunderstorm as argued by the applicant.

Page 2 of 3 Case No. 280/14

6. Now let us see what may be another reason for heavy reading of 1159 units in September 2014. In this angle we have perused CPL of the applicant. In June 2014 status is "Inaccessible" and there was billing of 374 units. In August 2014 there is reading of only 557 units. Considering the consumption trend of the applicant it appears that this reading of August 2014 is though shown for a period of 2 months but in fact 557 units is reading of only one month. Now let us turn to September 2014 & CPL shows that reading is 1159 units for 1 month. In our opinion in fact though the reading of September 2014 is shown as reading of one month, in fact it is the reading of 3 months and therefore in our opinion applicant is entitled for slab benefit for July 2014, August 2014 & September 2014 and accordingly bills need to be revised. Hence following order:

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is partly allowed.
- 2) Bill of the applicant for September 2014 for 1159 units be revised by giving slab benefit for July 2014, August 2014 & September 2014.
- 3) Compliance should be reported within one month from the date of this order.

Sd/-(Anil Shrivastava) MEMBER SECRETARY Sd/-(Adv. Subhash Jichkar) MEMBER Sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil), CHAIRMAN