

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/149/2015

Applicant : Shri Shivshankar E. Mankar,
Bhim Nagar, Galli No. 2,
Rameshwari Road,
Nagpur : 400 027.

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

Applicant :- In Person.

Respondent by 1) Dy.E.E. Nodal Office.
2) Shri Rody, Nodal Office.
3) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL Nagpur.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,
Chairman.

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar,
Member.

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

ORDER PASSED ON 26.10.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 28.9.2015 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 his bills are excessive. He approached to I.G.R.C. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. he approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dated 9.10.2015. It is submitted that meter is tested in the laboratory of SNDL on 22.9.2015 and it is found O.K. Therefore bill can not be revised.

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

5. During the course of arguments applicant argued that in the month of July 2015, there is consumption of 833 units and it is excessive. However, we have carefully perused the record. CPL shows that in June 2015, there was "Locked" status and average billing for 445 units. In July 2015 actual reading was taken and consumption was 833 units for 2 months. It means per month it was about 416 units. Non applicant had even given credit of Rs. 3361.87 in July 2015.

6. Now let us consider consumption trend of the applicant. It is noteworthy that in May 2012, consumption was 353 units. In June 2012 – 639 units, in July 2012 – 407 units, in April 2013 – 518 units, in May 2013 – 428 units, in June 2013 – 536 units, July 2013 -

410 units, August 2013 – 306 units, September 2013 – 328 units, October 2013 – 487 units. It is noteworthy that in May 2014, consumption was 876 units, in June 2014 – 516, in July 2014 – 515 units. October 2014 – 450 units, in November 2014 – 429 units, in March 2015 – 398 units, April 2015 – 494 units, May 2015 – 442 units. Therefore there is similar trend of consumption.

7. So far as conduct of the applicant is concerned, it is noteworthy that on meter testing report (MMG) Dt. 3.9.2015, at the bottom in the column of consumers signature, there is specific “Note” to the effect that consumer did not allow officers of SNDL to prepare meter testing report, consumer did not tell his name. Consumer refused to sign and asked the officials to go outside. Therefore this conduct is also not proper. If consumer does not agree with meter testing report, he can make special endorsement to the effect that “I do not agree with this testing report” and on making such endorsement consumer has to sign it. Therefore this attitude is contrary to the regulations and law. Similarly, it appears that spot inspection report is also manipulated. In spot inspection report, column regarding No. of rooms, No. of persons, No. of floors and No. of washrooms are kept blank. During the course of argument, we enquired to the consumer about the rooms and unwillingly anyhow consumer admitted that there are 9 rooms. However, in spot inspection report only 3 fans, 4 CFL, 1 tube light, 2 T.Vs., 1 freeze, 1 motor pump and 1 mixer is shown. When there are admittedly 9 rooms, it is unbelievable that there are only 3 fans and 4/5 lights specially when there are 2 TVs. Column of cooler, A.C., Geezer,

washing machine are again kept blank. Therefore spot inspection report appears to be doubtful.

8. Meter is tested in the laboratory of SNDL and it is found O.K. Therefore consumption utilized by the applicant is recorded by the meter and hence bill can not be revised. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

9. Order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. is legal and proper and needs no interference. Hence following order :-

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

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

Sd/-
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shivajirao S. Patil),
CHAIRMAN