

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/035/2009**

- Applicants : Shri Bhausahab S. Tijare,  
At post Paradsingha,  
Taluka Katol,  
Dist. Nagpur.  
Corresponding Address:-  
Plot No. 52, Ulhasnagar,  
Manewada Road, Parvatinagar  
Nagpur.
- Non-applicant : MSEDCL represented by  
the Nodal Officer-  
Executive Engineer,  
Katol Division, NUZ,  
Nagpur.
- Quorum Present : 1) Shri S.F. Lanjewar,  
Executive Engineer &  
Member Secretary,  
Consumer Grievance Redressal  
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,  
Nagpur.
- 2) Smt. Gauri Chandrayan,  
Member,  
Consumer Grievance Redressal  
Forum,  
Nagpur Urban Zone,  
Nagpur.

**ORDER (Passed on 01.08.2009)**

The present grievance application is filed on 03.06.2009 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity

Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 here-in-after referred-to-as the said Regulations.

The grievance of the applicant is in respect of regular supply was disconnected by J.E. Pardsingha for a period of one month. Excess amount recovered & calculated in various heads. Not given any consent and relevant reply of compliant by Junior Engineer. Not supplied any documents as demanded by him and not given a single reply of his complaints. Why IGRC has not given any reply to the complaint which was submitted to IGRC on dated 20.03.2008.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed his grievance before the Junior Engineer Pardsingha for disconnection of supply without giving suitable reply the complaint registered on dated 07.01.2009, 21.01.2009 & dated 27.12.2008 for incorrect calculations in monthly bills and additional security deposit. However, no reply was provided to his grievance and hence, the present grievance application is filed.

The following documents were submitted by the applicant with application.

The letter written to Junior Engineer Shri Sharma on dated 07.01.2009 regarding disconnection of supply without giving satisfactory reply of complaint registered.

The letter written to Junior Engineer Shri Sharma on dated 21.11.2009 regarding not giving any competent reply of complaint and power supply was disconnected.

The letter written to Assistant Engineer Katol regarding billing on dated 08.02.2009. The letter also written to Superintending

Engineer NRC on dated 27.02.2009 regarding regular power supply disconnected by Junior Engineer.

The letter written to Executive Engineer Katol on dated 09.03.2009 regarding regular power supply disconnected.

The letter written to S.E. NRC on dated 27.02.2009 regular power supply disconnected by Junior Engineer Shri Sharma.

The letter written to Hon'ble Minister on dated 17.03.2009 without any relevant reply to complaint residential regular power.

He lastly prayed that the expected relevant action on Junior Engineer and relevant justice to reply of complaints, why regular power supply was disconnected by Junior Engineer when the complaint was in process.

Before approaching to this Forum Shri Tijare has submitted his written letter on dated 16.10.2008 to Shri Sharma J.E. In which he has narrated nos. of points related to billing.

He had also submitted the calculation sheet of the billing which he had calculated.

He had also written letters to A.E. Katol on dated 08.12.2008 in which he had demanded the details of the reply regarding monthly bill which was charged as a excess billing.

He had submitted the letter to Junior Engineer on dated 27.12.2008 to JE Paradsingha regarding incomplete calculation in monthly bills and additional security deposit.

He had also submitted a letter to S.E. NRC on dated 31.12.2008 regarding fabricated and indiscriminate calculation in various bills and non-compliance of valid reply of complaint to the applicant as per his demand raised in the application.

The applicant contended that the Mistake of fact excess unit bill was fabricated and indiscriminate calculations in various bill as said above.

The applicant is also alleged that the various complaints have been given to non-applicant but non-applicant has not given a single reply to the applicant and continuous complaints kept pending intentionally, knowingly and unlawfully by the non-applicant. In this way the non-applicant has not justified controversial complaint given by the applicant. The applicant has pointed out the mistake of facts in various energy bills by preparing year-wise statements. The non-applicant was not admitting the mistake of facts. Without giving any competent reply of the complainant the non-applicant has no any legal right to disconnect the regular supply of complainant accordingly to the rules and provision. But why not accepting the mistake of facts made by non-applicant in the various energy bills. At first rectify the mistake of the facts committed by the non-applicant and take legal action against the defaulters. The incomplete and discriminate calculations made by the non-applicant intentionally.

The applicant lastly prayed, to correct the energy bills and give natural justice to the applicant.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise reply on dated 30.06.2009 to the applicant contended that the applicant as per the letter No. AE/T/1346 dated 10.11.2008 and A.E./Rev./167 dated 04.02.2009 the details information was provided to the applicant.

The matter was heard on dated 23.06.2009 & 07.07.2009 it was decided that the applicant shall approach to MSEDCL office and they will jointly find out the correct solution as per circular and the

hearing was adjourned, again the case was heard on dated 28.07.2009. The applicant had repeated the same matter as earlier in the hearing. The non-applicant replied that the applicant did not approach to the MSEDCL office as per decided in the previous hearing.

The non-applicant also elaborated that the details of security deposit is also given as per circular no. 57 on dated 07.07.2007. The details of interest on S.D. are given in circular no. 94 dated 09.03.2009.

He also added that in the month of April to June the interest is shown and it is adjusted in the bills. The MERC Regulations copy is not available in his office. The use of commercial is wrongly written in the place of DL-885, it is corrected by filling of B-34 form. He also provided the following documents to applicant.

- 1) मुंबई विद्युत शुल्क अधिनियम १९९८ अधिसूचना दिनांक 31 मार्च 2003.
- 2) Commercial Circular No. 57 dated 07.07.2007 recovery of Additional Security Deposit of D.O.P. MSEDCL.
- 3) Commercial Circular No. 94 dated 09.03.2009 rate of Interest on consumer's security deposit for the year 2008-2009 of C.E. commercial.
- 4) Circular No. 93 dated 06.03.2009 regarding FAC charges for the month of December 2008 to be levied in the billing month of March, 2009 of C.E. commercial.

But the non-applicant replied that the applicant did not approach to the MSEDCL office.

The non-applicant also replied that the MERC's orders are also available on MERC website.

We have carefully gone through all the submissions made before us by both the parties and also all documents produced on record by both of them.

The Forum has come to the conclusion.

- 1) The current energy bill has to be given by MSEDCL as per circular to the applicant.
- 2) The applicant shall pay the arrears amount within stipulated time period as per rules.

Sd/-  
**(S.F. Lanjewar)**  
Member-Secretary

Sd/-  
**(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)**  
MEMBER  
CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM  
**MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD's**  
**NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.**

Member-Secretary  
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum,  
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co.Ltd.,  
Nagpur Urban Zone, NAGPUR.