

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)044007

Applicant : Shri Ravindra Baliramji Dongre
Plot No. 279,
New Subhedar Layout,
NAGPUR.

Non-applicant : MSEDCL represented by
the Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
Mahal Division, NUZ,
Nagpur.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri S.D. Jahagirdar,
Chairman,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,
Member,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum,
Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

3) Shri S.J. Bhargawa
Executive Engineer &
Member Secretary,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 23.08.2007)

The present grievance application has been filed on 23.07.2007 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 excessive billing for the months of April and May 2007.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed his complaint on the same subject-matter of the present grievance before the IGRC (in short the Cell) on 07.07.2007 under the said Regulations. In response to this complaint application, the Cell, upon enquiry and hearing, informed the applicant by its letter, being letter no. 4701 dated 25.04.2007, that the applicant's meter was tested twice and it was found that the applicant's meter was fault-free. Hence, the billing done to the applicant was correct and proper.

Being aggrieved by this decision of the Cell, the applicant has filed the present grievance application.

The matter was heard on 17.08.2007.

The applicant's case was presented before this Forum by his nominated representative one Shri Sanjay A. Kotgirwar.

The applicant's representative contented that the applicant's monthly average consumption previous to April 2007 was ranging between 62 units and 169 units. However, the applicant was billed for 979 units in the billing month of April 2007 and for 587 units in the billing month of May, 2007. This consumption, according to him, is abnormal and not in tune with his normal pattern of consumption. He stressed that the applicant's consumption against his new meter is also never seen to be as high as 979 or 587 units. Hence, his request is that the applicant be billed as per his average

monthly consumption as shown by the metered readings of the new meter. He is not satisfied with the meter testing report dated 18.06.2007. He pointed out that his previous meter, being meter no. 5464876, which was tested in the Testing Division, NUZ, MSEDCL, Nagpur on 18.06.2007 is showing percentage error of (-) 2.91% in load test. Based on this, his say is that the meter testing report shows that the applicant's meter was defective. He has termed the two disputed energy bills as wrong and excessive.

He lastly prayed that these two bills may be quashed and the applicant should be charged only as per his previous monthly average consumption or alternatively, as per average monthly consumption as revealed by his new meter which was installed in April 2007 replacing his previous meter.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise report dated 01.08.2007 which is on record. He has stated in this report as well as in his oral submissions that upon payment of testing fee of Rs.100/- by the applicant on 10.04.2007, his meter, being meter no. 5464876, was tested in the meter testing laboratory of Mahal Division, NUC, Nagpur and the meter was found to be Ok. as per report dated 23.04.2007. Not satisfied by this report the applicant gave a fresh complaint which was received by him on 05.06.2007 in which he requested to re-test the meter. Accordingly, the applicant's said meter was got tested by the Executive Engineer Testing Division in the testing Division of NUZ, Nagpur on 18.06.2007. This testing was carried in the presence of the applicant. Load test was carried out in respect

of this meter and it was found that the meter testing results are satisfactory. In view of this position, the non-applicant assertively stated the applicant was billed correctly as per his metered consumption in the billing months of April and May, 2007. He, therefore, prayed that the grievance application may be rejected.

In the instant case, it is pertinent to note that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 5464876, was tested twice, firstly on 23.04.2007 and secondly on 18.06.2007. The second testing of the meter was carried out in the Testing Division of NUZ on 18.06.2007 in the presence of the applicant. Both the meter testing results show that the applicant's meter was not defective.

In view of above position, the only conclusion that can be drawn in this case is that the applicant was billed appropriately as per his metered consumption in the billing months of April and May, 2007. It is a matter of record that the applicant's meter was changed in the month of April, 2007. At the time of replacement of this meter, it was showing a final reading of 1903 units while the current reading of the applicant's disputed meter is shown as 1436 units in the billing month of April 2007. Hence, it is obvious that the applicant was required to make payment for consumption of $1903 - 1436 = 467$ units against his old meter in the billing month of May, 2007. This is the reason why the applicant's CPL is showing consumption of 467 units as adjustment units in the billing month of May, 2007. In addition, the applicant's consumption in the billing month of May 2007 is of 120 units against his new meter, being meter no. 5607252. Hence, a total

of 587 units is rightly charged to the applicant as per metered consumption in the billing month of May, 2007. In the billing month of April 2007, the applicant's old meter's current reading and previous reading were respectively noted as 1436 and 457 units. This is how the applicant was charged for 979 units (1436-457) in the billing month of April 2007. Since the applicant's disputed meter was found to be absolutely fault-free, the applicant's contention that excessive billing was done to him does not hold any substance.

A point has been made by the applicant's representative the applicant's consumption has never exceeded 180 units in any month previous to the billing month of April 2007. He has also tried to make a point that the applicant's new meter has also been showing the applicant's correct average monthly consumption to be below 200 units. Hence, he stated that the applicant should be billed as per his average consumption of around 180 units per month in the billing month of April and May 2007. However, this cannot be accepted for the simple reason that the applicant's meter was found to be fault-free and the applicant was billed in these two months as per his metered consumption. The only inference that can be drawn in this case is that the applicant has consumed 979 and 587 units respectively in the billing months of April 2007 and May 2007 since this was his metered consumption through a fault-free meter.

In the result, we hold that there is no substance in the present grievance application. The same, therefore, stands rejected.

Sd/-	Sd/\	Sd/-
(S.J. Bhargawa)	(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)	(S.D. Jahagirdar)
Member-Secretary	MEMBER	CHAIRMAN

**CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION CO LTD's
NAGPUR URBAN ZONE, NAGPUR.**