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

## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/044/2009

Applicant : Shri Dnyaneshwar N. Chaware

At Nagalwadi, Behind

Ordnance Factory Athwa Mail,

Wadi, NAGPUR.

Non-applicant: MSEDCL through

the Nodal Officer-Executive Engineer, Division No. II, NUZ,

Nagpur

Quorum Present :1) Shri S.F. Lanjewar

Executive Engineer & Member Secretary,

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,

Nagpur.

2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,

Member,

Consumer Grievance Redressal

Forum,

Nagpur Urban Zone,

Nagpur.

## ORDER (Passed on 17.09.2009)

This grievance application has been filed on 17.07.2009 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 applicant's complaint is in respect of erroneous and excessive billing June 2008 to September, 2008 vide meter no. 90000122146.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed his complaint on the same subject-matter of the grievance before the Internal Grievance Redressal Unit on 15.01.2009 under the provisions of MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006. The applicant, being not satisfied with the Cell's order, has filed the present grievance application under the said Regulations.

The matter was heard on 04.08.2009 and 18.08.2009.

The applicant's case was presented by his nominated representative one Shri D.G. Umare while the Assistant Engineer Shri Wankhede & Shri Dekate Assistant Accountant represented the non-applicant Company.

The applicant's representative contended that erroneous and excessive energy bills were received by applicant during the period from June 2008 to September, 2008 and such an excessive and wrong billing came due to meter being faulty. The consumption of the meter was in the month of June 2008 132 units, July 2008 875 units, August 2008 393 units & September, 2008 393 units were recorded. He added that the applicant's meter was changed on October, 2008 and the meter no. was 9010035443. The new meter electricity consumption was

recorded in October, 2008 43 units, November 2008 45 units December 2008 52 units & January, 2009 48 units.

The applicant also contended that above information was given to the non-applicant under the RTI Act, 2005 for faulty meter status & double consumption recorded & he is requested to test the meter in the Urban Testing Lab, being meter no. 9000122146.

It is, therefore, obvious that billing done to the applicant against faulty meter was not only erroneous but it was also excessive and, hence the same was unjust, improper and illegal. He prayed that bills may be revised appropriately.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise report dated 31.07.2009 which is on record. It has been stated in this report and also in the oral submissions before us by the Assistant Engineer that energy bill of Rs. 4896=80 has been revised as per meter testing report on dated 18.09.2008.

The non-applicant has also submitted the letter of meter testing report dated 18.08.2009 and the same is found faulty. As per provision MERC Rules & Regulation 2005 Regulation 15.4.1 the consumption of faulty meter should be charged for three months.

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

The Forum has come to a decision.

## Decision

The bill amount of prior three months shall be adjusted.

The non-applicant shall carry out this order and report the compliance to this Forum on or before 31.10.2009.

Sd/-

Sd/-

(S.F. Lanjewar)

(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)

**MEMBER** 

Member-Secretary

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.

Page 4 of 4

Case No. 044/2009