

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/0132/2006**

- Applicant : M/s. Jagdamba Seva Samiti,  
302, "A" Lokmat Bhavan,  
Wardha Road,  
Nagpur, through its Secretary  
Shri Tejram Dalvi.
- Non-Applicant : The Nodal Officer-  
Executive Engineer,  
Congressnagar Division,  
Nagpur representing the MSEDCL.
- 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.

**ORDER (Passed on 23.06.2006)**

The present grievance application has been filed on 31.05.2006 by the present applicant 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 energy bills generated by his defective meter, being meter no. 8000396315, during the period from June, 2004 to October 2005 and also in respect of the incorrect and excessive billing generated by his new meter, being meter no. 8000189440, from October 2005 onwards.

Before approaching this Forum, the applicant had filed a complaint dated 27.10.2005 before the Executive Engineer, Congressnagar Division, MSEDCL, Nagpur raising therein the present grievance. However, no satisfactory remedy was provided to him and hence, the present the grievance application.

Since the applicant had earlier approached the Executive Engineer, Congressnagar Division MSEDCL, Nagpur for redressal of his grievance and because the Executive Engineer did not forward his complaint to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell under Regulation 6.2 of the said Regulations, the applicant is deemed to have intimated his grievance to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell as per the provision contained in the second proviso to Regulation 6.2 of the said Regulations.

The matter was heard by us and adequate opportunity was given to both the parties to putforth their respective say.

A copy of the non-applicant's parawise report submitted by the non-applicant in terms of the said Regulations was given to the applicant on 22.06.2006 before the case was taken up for hearing and he was given opportunity to offer his say on this parawise report also.

The contention of the applicant is that his old meter, being meter no. 8000396315, was defective and that excessive and incorrect energy bills came to be issued to him against this meter during the

period from June, 2004 to October 2005. He had complained to the Assistant Engineer, MSEDCL, Congressnagar Division, Nagpur by his application dated 19.08.2005 in this regard. However, no remedy was provided to him. He had also made a complaint to the Assistant Engineer by another application, being application dated 27.10.2005, a copy of which was sent by him to the Executive Engineer, Congressnagar Division, Nagpur requesting therein to issue energy bills for minimum charges in respect of his old and new meters. He had specifically mentioned in this application that his meters were showing meter readings even though the main switches of the meters were put off. Since no satisfactory remedy was provided to him, he had no other option than to approach this Forum for redressal of his grievance.

He has produced copies of the following documents in support of his contentions.

- 1) His complaint application dated 27.10.2005 addressed to the Assistant Engineer, Congressnagar / Dhantoli, MSEDCL, Nagpur.
- 2) His disputed energy bill dated 18.10.2005 for 271 units.
- 3) His complaint application dated 19.08.2005 addressed to the Assistant Engineer, Congressnagar, Division, Nagpur.
- 4) His energy bill dated 27.04.2006 for 49 units for Rs.570/- showing inclusion of arrear amount of Rs.253.01/-.
- 5) His energy bill dated 29.05.2006 for 43 units for Rs.620/- showing inclusion of arrear amount of Rs.322.20/-.

He has prayed that his grievance in question may be removed and revised & correct energy bills issued to him.

The non-applicant has stated in his parawise report that mandatory fixed charge of Rs.200/- meant for commercial category consumers was charged to the applicant in his bi-monthly energy bills and that the grievances putforth are already duly enquired into by his staff and further that there is no substance in his grievances.

As regards the applicant's old meter, being meter no. 8000396315, installed at the applicant's premises and the energy bills generated by this meter, the say of the non-applicant is that a credit of Rs. 4,187.93 has already been given to the applicant for as many as 1109 units and that this credit pertains to the period from June, 2004 upto October 2005.

He vehemently argued that the applicant has now been charged only for 23 units as against 1132 units for which he was earlier wrongly charged during the period from June, 2004 upto October 2005 against the applicant's old meter. According to him, the credit already given is more than sufficient.

As regards the applicant's grievance in respect of his new meter, being meter no. 8000189440, the say of the non-applicant is that this meter was found to be working properly when it was checked by the staff on the basis of accucheck meter. He further submitted that his new meter has shown consumption of only 23 units in January 2006, 8 units in February 2006, 37 units in March, 2006 and 49 units in April 2006 which in turn was noticed as per his metered consumption. He vehemently stated that the applicant's complaint in this respect is baseless. He further submitted that there is every chance or possibility of any of the office-bearers of the applicant's Society or even some servant opening the premises for cleaning purposes etc. and thus

electricity must have actually been consumed. There may also be some internal wiring defect which needs to be corrected at the level of the consumer. He added that there is absolutely no deficiency of service as his representative has himself confirmed upon checking that the applicant's new meter was alright and it was not showing any consumption after the main switch was put off.

The non-applicant has produced a copy of his Assistant Engineer's letter, being letter no. 960 dated 15.06.2006, addressed to the applicant informing him about the credit given to him and a copy of the applicant's CPL from October, 2002 till May-2005.

He lastly submitted that the applicant's grievance application may be dismissed.

As regards the first grievance of the applicant about his previous meter, being meter no. 8000396315, and in respect of excessive energy bills for the period from June, 2004 to October 2005, it is a matter of record that the non-applicant has already given a credit of Rs.4,187.93 to the applicant in the billing month of June, 2006. Even the applicant is not denying this. The question is whether this credit already given to the applicant is proper and adequate. The non-applicant has demonstrated before us that the applicant was previously charged for 1132 units wrongly during the period from June 2004 to October 2005 and further that a credit for 1109 units as against 1132 units is already given to the applicant against his bills generated by his old meter. In nut-shell, the applicant has now been charged only for 23 units against his old meter during the period from June, 2004 to October 2005 i.e. for 18 months. This evidently goes to show that the credit already given to the applicant against his disputed energy bills

was not only correct but it was also undoubtedly adequate. There is now no reason to believe that any injustice was caused to the applicant in this regard.

The applicant's grievance about incorrect and excessive energy bills pertaining to his old meter does not, therefore, survive now.

The applicant's another grievance is that although his premises is not in use, his new meter, being meter no. 8000189440, is showing meter readings and he is being charged erroneously against his new meter although the main switch of the new meter is always off. The non-applicant's say is that his new meter has already been checked on the basis of accucheck meter by his staff and it has been verified that the new meter in question is fault-free. However, he admitted that the applicant's new meter was not checked in the applicant's presence. The non-applicant ought to have checked the meter in the presence of the applicant. We now direct the non-applicant to check the applicant's new meter in his presence by giving him adequate prior notice. It should be confirmed afresh after due checking whether the applicant's new meter is properly working or not. If upon checking the meter in the presence of applicant, it is found that the applicant's meter is fault-free, then question of revision of the applicant's energy bills from October 2005 onwards would not arise. In the event of this meter being found faulty upon fresh checking, the applicant's energy bills will have be revised appropriately by the non-applicant as per the Supply Code Regulations.

The non-applicant shall accordingly take further action in this respect.

With these directions, the applicant's grievance application stands disposed off.

Sd/-  
**(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)**  
MEMBER

Sd/-  
**(S.D. Jahagirdar)**  
CHAIRMAN

**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**