## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/44/2012

- Applicant : Shri Mangilal Jain , Through Son Bhushan Mangilal Jain, At Shri Mahavir Pipe & Mill Stores Gandhibagh, NAGPUR.
- Non-applicant : Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee), MSEDCL, NUC, NAGPUR.

## Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/45/2012

- Applicant : Shri Bhushan Jain , At House No. 355, C.A. Road, Gandhibagh, NAGPUR.
- Non-applicant : Nodal Officer, The Superintending Engineer, (Distribution Franchisee), MSEDCL, NUC, NAGPUR.
- <u>Quorum Present</u> : 1) Shri. Shivajirao S. Patil Chairman,
  - 2) Adv. Smt. Gouri Chandrayan, Member,
  - 3) Smt. Kavita K. Gharat Member Secretary.

## ORDER PASSED ON 7.6.2012.

# <u>COMMON ORDER PASSED IN CASE NO. 44/12 AND</u> <u>45/12</u>

1. Both these cases vide Case No. 44/12 and 45/12 are on one and the same point and similar issue is involved in both these Grievance applications. Therefore, it is desirous and convenient to dispose off both these applications by common order. Therefore, Forum proceeds to decide both these applications by common order.

2. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 9.4.2012 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

3. The applicant's case in brief is that since May 2011, consumption of the applicant is increasing in the bills. The applicant orally complained M.S.E.D.C.L. but there was no compliance. The applicant filed written complaint in September 2011 and it was acknowledged but even then meter was not tested and bills received as usual recording excessive consumption. There is variation in monthly units but no action is taken. The applicant had deposited the bills under protest. Therefore, it is grievance of the applicant that since May 2011 the applicant is receiving excessive bills therefore those bills need to be revised.

4. The non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 4.5.2012. It is submitted that on 10.9.2011 the applicant filed application to M/s. SPANCO that meter is fast and therefore meter be tested but did not deposit testing fees and therefore meter was not tested. On 27.4.2012, Officers of M/s. SPANCO went to inspect the spot but the applicant did not permit to inspect. Huge amount is due against the applicant. The application is false and deserves to be dismissed.

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

6. During the course of hearing, Forum passed the order Dt. 8.5.2012 and directed the applicant to deposit meter testing charges. The applicant was ready to deposit meter testing charges and non applicant was ready to check the meter. Therefore on 8.5.2012, this Forum has passed order directing the applicant to deposit the meter testing charges and directing the non applicant to check the meter in the laboratory in presence of the applicant and to submit the report and case was adjourned on 25.5.2012.

7. Mean while Dy. Executive Engineer, Testing Division, Nagpur filed meter testing report Dt. 1.6.2012 on record to the effect that in both these cases, both the meters are tested and both the meters are found O.K. and in order. 8. Therefore so far as excessive consumption is concerned, it only because of more consumption of the applicant that the bills were increased and there can not be any other reason. Therefore, it is clear that the bills issued by non applicant are as per meter reading and both the meters in both cases are accurate. Therefore, we find no force in this application and application deserves to be dismissed. Resultantly, Forum proceeds to pass following order :-

### <u>ORDER</u>

1) Grievance application Case No. 44/12 Shri Mangilal Jain through son Bhushan Jain Vs. MSEDCL, is hereby dismissed.

Grievance application Case No. 45/12 Bhushan Jain Vs.
MSEDCL, is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-Sd/-(Smt.K.K.Gharat) (Adv.Smt.GauriChandrayan) (ShriShivajirao S.Patil)MEMBERMEMBERCHAIRMANSECRETARY