Applicant	 Shri Sanjay R. Mishra, User:- Shri Manish Toravat, Shop No. 83, NMC Shopping Complex, Nagpur:440 012.
Non-applicant	: Nodal Officer,
iton applicant	The Executive Engineer,
	Congressnagar Division,
	MSEDCL, NUC,
	NAGPUR.
<u>Quorum Present</u>	: 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman.
	2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar Member.
	3) Shri Anil Shrivastava, Member / Secretary.

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/283/2014

ORDER PASSED ON 5.1.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 10.11.2014 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 he filed an application for change of name on 9.10.2013, but there was no change of name. Applicant sent reminders on 7.4.2014, 27.8.2014, 4.9.2014 and 13.11.2014. Name of the applicant was changed in the billing of November 2014. M.S.E.D.C.L. mean while directed the applicant to comply certain documents. Applicant completed the compliance on 10.7.2014. Even then name was changed in November 2014. Therefore applicant claimed compensation of Rs. 10000/-

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 27.11.2014. It is submitted that Regent Sub-Division office has received the application for change of name on 9.10.2013. After verification of the documents submitted by the applicant, following discrepancies were observed:-

A) Sale Deed on Notary Basis.

B) Tax Receipt/Mutation/Akhiv Patrika of new consumer not attached.

C) Signature of old consumer of applicant.

Accordingly Regent Sub-Division had given message to new applicant on Mobile No. 9823012474 on 25.10.2013, whereas the consumer submitted required documents on 10.7.2014. After verifying the documents submitted, Regent Sub-Division has sanctioned change of name case and issued demand note to the applicant. Applicant had submitted Money Receipt to Regent Sub-Division on 5.11.2014. Regent Sub-Division office then submitted necessary document i.e. B-32 to I.T. Section Nagpur. Necessary effect i.e. change of name of Shri M.R. Mishra is implemented as Shri Manish Mohanlal Toravat in the energy bill of concerned consumer. Revised energy bill is enclosed with reply. It is not true to say that M.S.E.D.C.L. has deliberately delayed the change of name whereas the applicant had submitted required additional documents late. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. On close scrutiny of the record, it appears that applicant filed application for change of name on 9.10.2013. M.S.E.D.C.L. verified the documents produced by the applicant and following discrepancies were observed :-

A) Sale Deed on Notary Basis.

B) Tax Receipt/Mutation/Akhiv Patrika of new consumer not attached.

C) There was no Signature of old consumer of applicant.

6. Accordingly, Regent Sub-Division had given the message to new applicant on Mobile No. 9823012474 on 25.10.2013, where as the consumer submitted required documents on 10.7.2014. Therefore since 25.10.2013 till 10.7.2014, it was for the applicant to comply the discrepancies but applicant was silent during this whole period and it is only because of the applicant the matter was delayed. Applicant submitted compliance of discrepancies on 10.7.2014 and thereafter M.S.E.D.C.L. verified the compliance and sanctioned change of name case and issued demand note to the applicant. Applicant had submitted the money receipt to Regent Sub-Division on 5.11.2014. Regent Sub-Division then submitted necessary documents i.e. B-32 to I.T. section Nagpur. The change of name is carried out in the month of November 2014.

7. Therefore there was no delay or negligence on the part of employee or officials of M.S.E.D.C.L. but delay is caused due to non compliance / late compliance of the discrepancies by the applicant.

8. It is an admitted fact that change of name is carried out in the month of November 2014 and that grievance is full redressed. So far as compensation is concerned, there was no deliberate delay or negligence on the part of M.S.E.D.C.L. and hence applicant is not entitled for any compensation. 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