

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/337/2014

Applicant : Shri Balwant Y. Nivant,
2/31, Raje Raghujji Nagar,
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,
The Superintending Engineer,
(Distribution Franchisee),
MSEDCL,
NAGPUR.

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil,
Chairman.

2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar
Member.

3) Shri Anil Shrivastava,
Member / Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 20.2.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 23.12.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. Applicant's case in brief is that he is receiving excessive bills since change of meter in March 2012. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. he approached to this Forum.

3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 7.1.2015. It is submitted that meter is tested by acucheck on 20.7.2014 and it is found O.K. Learned I.G.R.C. ordered to test the meter in meter testing laboratory in presence of the applicant and to take further action on revision of the disputed bill if so necessitated as per the findings of laboratory testing. Accordingly meter was tested in the laboratory in presence of the applicant on 2.12.2014 and it is found correct. Therefore bill can not be revised.

4. Forum heard argument of non applicant and perused record.

5. Spot inspection report shows that it is doubtful. Specific note is written on this spot inspection report that load is noted only as per the say of the consumer. Therefore it is clear that applicant did not allow to note down the actual load. Forum personally interrogated the applicant at the time of hearing and enquired about the connected load. Applicant told that there are total six rooms. Out of them three rooms on the ground floor and 3 rooms on first floor. There are 6 fans, 7 CFL, 1 freeze, 1 T.V., 2 Coolers, 1 Motor Pump. His one son who is B.D.S. resides on first floor. His two sons are residing at Mumbai & Hyderabad, but they visit the applicant's house and reside with the applicant during the summer. He further told that now 2 meters are working. In November – December 2014 another meter is installed. In spot inspection report also, there is note at the bottom to the effect that there are 2 meters on the spot. It is double storied building. There is use of Consumer No. 410011343441 for ground floor and Consumer No. 41001221820139 is used for first floor. As per the rules of M.S.E.D.C.L. 2 meters are not permissible in one premises for one family specially when

it is joint family. Therefore these two meters appear to have been installed to take illegal benefit of slab billing. Spot inspection report is completely doubtful and applicant has suppressed connected load.

6. S.N.D.L. officers argued that in November – December 2014 old meter is replaced and another meter is installed. Meter is tested in the laboratory and it is found O.K. Therefore it is clear that consumption recorded by the meter is the consumption utilised by the applicant and hence grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Therefore Forum proceeds to pass following order : -

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Anil Shrivastava)
MEMBER
SECRETARY

Sd/-
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shivajirao S. Patil),
CHAIRMAN