| <u>Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/003/2015</u> | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Applicant | Smt. Seema D. Barsagade, 14, Kirti Nagar, Narasala Road, Dighori, Nagpur - 34. |
| Non–applicant | Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee), MSEDCL, NAGPUR. |
| <u>Quorum Present</u> | : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil, Chairman. |
| | 2) Adv. Subhash Jichkar Member. |
| | 3) Shri Anil Shrivastava, |

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/003/2015

ORDER PASSED ON 25.2.2015.

Member / Secretary.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 01.01.2015 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 she received excessive bills. Therefore she approached to Learned I.G.R.C. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C., Dt. 24.11.2014, she approached to this Forum. 3. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 14.1.2015. It is submitted that meter was tested by acucheck on 18.10.2014 and it is found O.K. As per order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. Dt. 24.11.2014 meter is replaced, old meter is tested in the laboratory of SNDL in presence of the applicant and it is found correct. Therefore bill can not be revised. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. CPL of the applicant shows that in the month of September 2014, consumption is shown 1466 units but it is for 4 months. There was Inaccessible and Locked status in June, July & August 2014. Therefore in September 2014, it is the bill of 4 months and slab benefit of Rs. 1929.54 is already given to the applicant in September 2014.

6. We have enquired the applicant about connected load and she told before the Forum that there are 8 rooms, six fans, 8 tube lights, 8 CFLs., 1 T.V., 1 freeze, 2 coolers, 1 motor pump and 1 geezer. Therefore it appears that there is heavy connected load of the applicant. It is noteworthy that in spite of this heavy load, consumption of the applicant shown in 2012 and 2013 appears to be very very less and suspicious. In January 2012, consumption was 30 units, Feb.2012 – 64 units, March 2012-40 units, April 2012 – 46 units, May 2012 - 94 units, June 2012 – 56 units, August 2012 - 23 units, September 2012 -15 units, December 2012 - 43units, February 2013 - 39 units, March 2013 – 22 units, April 2013 - 32 units, July 2013 - 26 units, August 2013 - 25 units and therefore that meter was replaced in October 2013. After replacement of the meter, reasonable consumption is appearing. Therefore it is clear that before November 2013, either the meter was slow or actual reading was not taken by the Meter Reader by joining the hands with applicant, otherwise such type of less

consumption is practically impossible. After replacement of the meter in November 2013, reasonable consumption is appearing.

7. In June 2014, there was Inaccessible status, in July 2014 – Locked status and August 2014 Inaccessible status. Actual reading was taken in September 2014 and consumption was 1466 units for 4 months. If it is divided into 4 months, it will come around 350 units per month only. Slab benefit of the same is given in October 2014 for Rs. 1929.54. Therefore bills are not excessive.

8. Meter is tested by acucheck on 28.10.2014. Meter is again tested in laboratory of SNDL on 1.12.2014 in presence of the applicant and it is found correct. Therefore bills can not be revised.

9. Order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. is legal and valid, and therefore needs no interference. 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