Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Ltd.'s Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nagpur Zone, Nagpur	
<u>Case No. CGRF(NZ)/218/2015</u>	
Applicant	 M/s. Sudha Oil Seeds (Mr.Sunil Chachra, Prop.) 482/A-29, Sukh-Sagar Bhawan Borgaon, Nagpur-13.
Non–applicant	 Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (D/F.) NUC,MSEDCL, NAGPUR.

Applicant :- In person.

Respondent by 1) Shri N.P.Larokar, Nodal Office. 2) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL Nagpur.

> <u>Quorum Present</u> : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman.

> > 2)Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member, Secretary

ORDER PASSED ON 22.01.2016.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 03.12.2015 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. Non applicant, denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 21.12.2015.

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

Page 1 of 2

Case No.218/2015

4. Applicant argued that he informed to disconnect his supply and therefore date of P.D. should be considered 08-10-2013 instead of 01-06-2015. However applicant did not produced copy of the alleged application dated 08-10-2013 to show that he requested to disconnect the supply since 08-10-2013. Officers of SNDL argued that applicant did not file any application dated 08-10-2013 with a request to disconnect the supply. On the contrary supply was disconnected for non payment of the bill Rs.7,39,590/- and the bill is already revised for Rs.4,38,380/- considering T.D. date of 6 months.

5. As there is no express prayer in any application filed by the applicant on record dated 08-10-2013, we find no force in the allegations of the applicant that he requested for disconnect on 08-10-2013. It appears that the applicant is trying to take disadvantage of the circumstances and falsely alleging that he applied on 08-10-2013.

6. We have carefully perused detailed order passed by the IGRC. It is legal and proper. Therefore needs no interference.

7. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence the following order.

ORDER

1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-(Mrs.V.N.Parihar) MEMBER/SECRETARY sd/-(Shivajirao S. Patil), CHAIRMAN

Case No.218/2015