

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/274/2014

Applicant : Smt. Veena Charandas Gajbhiye,
Plot No. 49, Kamgar Nagar,
Behind Jattewar Krishna Sabhagrih,
Nandanwan,
Nagpur : 440 009.

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 24.12.2014.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 30.10.2014 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 April 2014, applicant is receiving excessive bills. Therefore those bills may be revised. Applicant approached to I.G.R.C. Being aggrieved by the said order passed by I.G.R.C. Dt. 26.9.2014, applicant approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 17.11.2014. It is submitted that meter was tested by acucheck on 25.7.2014 and it is found correct. Again meter was tested in meter testing lab on 9.10.2014 in presence of the applicant and it is found O.K. Grievance application may be dismissed.

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

5. Name of the applicant is Smt. Veena Charandas Gajbhiye vide Consumer No. 41001852309. There is also another meter in this premises in the name of her husband Shri Charanndas M. Gajbhiye, Consumer No. 410014283769. Non applicant had produced CPL of both these consumer husband and wife. Complaint of the applicant is that since April 2014, she is receiving excessive bills. In April 2014 reading is 567 units, in May 2014 the reading is 826, in June 2014 reading is 982 units, in July 2014 reading is 530 units, in August 2014 reading 358, in September 2014 reading 367 units, and in October 2014 reading is 672 units. Since April 2014, it is summer season.

6. On careful perusal of the record, it appears that it is a duplex. One meter is in the name of wife and another meter is in the

name of husband. CPL of both the meters show that wisely and cleverly load is diverted on one meter in particular months and naturally consumption of one meter appears tremendously less and consumption of another meter appears to be increased. We have already observed reading of meter of the applicant since April 2014. Now let us turn to the reading of the meter of husband Shri Charandas Gajbhiye, Consumer No. 410014283769 in the relevant period. It is rather surprising to note that in April 2014, consumption of husband was 188 units. In May 2014 '0' units, in June 2014 '0' units, in July 2014 '0' units, in August 2014 '0' units, in September 2014 '179' units and in October 2014 '0' units. Therefore in May, June, July, August and October 2014 there was '0' consumption of husband of the applicant, whereas his consumption trend shows that in May 2013, his consumption was 1190 units, in June 2013 consumption was 529 units, in September 2012 consumption was 501 units, in October 2012, 556 units. In April 2012 his consumption was 1231 units. In May 2012, 969 units and in June 2012, 577 units. It means consumption of husband of the applicant is more than 1000 units in some summer seasons but in 2014 summer, his consumption was '0'. Therefore it is clear that load on the meter of husband of the applicant Shri Charandas Gajbhiye was definitely diverted on the meter of the applicant in April, May, June, July, August & September on the meter of the applicant. It is pertinent to note that in October 2014, meter of husband of the applicant Shri Charandas Gajbhiye, Consumer No. 410014283769 is made P.D. and therefore since October 2014 onwards his consumption is '0'. But before October 2014 also, in the month of May, June, July & August 2014, how his consumption was '0' every month forms a big question mark.

7. CPL of the applicant shows that in previous period her consumption was shown tremendously less. In October 2013, 101 units, in November 2013, 54 units, in December 2013, 51 units, in January 2014 81 units, in February 2014, 42 units & March 2014, 138 units. Considering spot inspection report and connected load, it appears that there is some mischief played and therefore only such type of less consumption is appearing in earlier period. Spot inspection report of the applicant shows that there are 5 rooms and 3 washrooms. There are 5 fans, 2 tube lights, 2 CFL, 3 TVs, 1 freeze, 2 A.Cs., 1 set top box, 1 home theatre, 1 water filter, 2 PCs, 2 ovens, 1 LED light. When this load is verified with the applicant during the course of hearing applicant was changing version from time to time and was suppressing the facts. Therefore spot inspection report Dt. 22.11.2014 appears to be manipulated. Even if for the sake of arguments, it is presumed that load shown in the spot inspection report is correct and proper, even then such less consumption like 54 units (October 2013), 51 units (December 2013), 81 units (January 2014), 42 units (Feb. 2014), 138 units (March 2014) is practically not possible. Therefore it is clear that every thing was manipulated regarding both the consumers husband wife to suppress the real load. When that magic came to an end, real recording of consumption started which the applicant thinks to be excessive. During the course of arguments, it was specifically enquired to husband of the applicant, whether connected load shown in the spot inspection report is the connected load only on the meter of his wife, he said yes and further said that connected load of his meter is in addition. Again he realized his mistake and wisely changed his version and told that entire load is mentioned in the spot inspection report and there is

no separate load on his meter. In our opinion applicant side is suppressing the truth.

8. Considering connected load, in our opinion reading is proper.

9. It is noteworthy that meter is tested in meter testing laboratory and it is found O.K. Therefore consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilised by the applicant. Therefore there is no scope for revision of bill. 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