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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/165/2006

Applicant : M/s. Anand Melting Pvt. Ltd.,
Plot No. J-10, MIDC, Hingna,
Nagpur.

Non–applicant : MSEDCL represented by
the Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
MIDC Division, NUZ,
Nagpur.

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.

3) Shri S.J. Bhargawa
Executive Engineer &
Member Secretary,
Consumer Grievance Redressal
Forum, Nagpur Urban Zone,
Nagpur.

ORDER (Passed on 31.01.2007)

The present grievance application has been filed on 07.11.2006 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 his faulty HT meter, being meter No. MSE-01754 and in respect of erroneous and excessive energy bills issued to the applicant.

The applicant has sought for following reliefs from this Forum.

1. To issue an interim order under Regulation 8.3 of the said Regulations directing the non-applicant to refund the excess amount charged, along with interest for consumption of 458280 units, being the difference in the consumption recorded by his faulty meter, being meter No. MSE-01754 and the one recorded by the additional meter from the date of submission of record by the non-applicant i.e. from 31/10/2005 till date considering this excess consumption to be consumption of slot D i.e. from 18.00 Hrs to 22.00 Hrs;
2. To direct the non-applicant to revise energy bill for the month of August 2006 considering the slot wise readings of the additional meter;
3. To direct the non-applicant under Regulation 6.17(a) to submit slot wise record of readings of additional meter including MD recorded from the date of installation of the additional meter;
4. To issue a final order directing the non-applicant to refund the excess amount charged to the applicant along with interest for difference in slot wise consumption and MD recorded by the faulty meter and the additional meter from the date of installation.

5. To direct the non-applicant to compensate the direct losses of the applicant like salary & wages payment, interest paid to the banks etc. during closer period from 19/9/2006.
6. To direct the non-applicant to withdraw the tariff minimum bills beyond 19/9/2006 till the supply is reconnected.

The applicant had intimated the Executive Engineer, MIDC Division, MSEDCL, Hingna Road, Nagpur about his grievance on the same subject-matter by his complaint dated 13.08.2006 which the Executive Engineer has duly received on 14.08.2006. No satisfactory remedy was provided to the applicant's grievance either by the Executive Engineer, MIDC Dn., MSEDCL, Hingna Road, Nagpur or by the Superintending Engineer, NUZ, MSEDCL, Nagpur and hence the present grievance application. The intimation given to the non-applicant on 13.08.2006 is deemed to be the intimation given to the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (IGRC) in terms of Regulation 6.4 (second proviso) of the said Regulations and as such the requirement of the applicant approaching the IGRC in terms of the said Regulations stands dispensed with.

The present grievance application was heard on 29.11.2006,19.12.2006,27.12.2006,08.01,2007, 12.01.2007 and finally on 15.01.2007.

The applicant's case was presented before us by his nominated representative one Shri R.B. Goenka.

As laid down in Regulation 6.18 of the said Regulations, the Forum is supposed to redress any such grievance upon enquiry as expeditiously as possible and to pass appropriate order on the grievance for its redressal within a maximum period of two months from the date of receipt of the grievance by the Forum. In the present case, this grievance application was filed on 07.11.2006 and as such normally it ought to have been decided and order passed on or before 07.01.2007. However, in the present case, order has been passed on 31.01.2007. Thus, there is a delay of 24 days beyond two months in passing this order. This delay has been caused because both the parties from time to time have sought additional time for making their submissions in reply to each other's rejoinders and also because of the intricacies involved in the matter. Retrieval and analysis of computerized data registered in the applicant's HT meter and of data displayed by the additional meter also took sometime. It was also necessary from justice of view to afford adequate opportunity to both the parties to make their written and oral submissions. Both the parties had also specifically asked for time to reconcile the statistical data for ascertaining the exact quantum of consumption registered by the applicant's meter and additional meter. This also consumed some time. Because of all these events, a delay of 24 days has been caused in passing the final order in the present case. The Forum observes that this delay has been caused for sufficient reasons. The delay caused thus stands justified for sufficient reasons.

The applicant is a consumer of the non-applicant Company having sanctioned contract demand of 2000 KVA

with a sanctioned load of 2400 KW. The non-applicant installed a HT meter, being meter No. MSE-01754, at the applicant's Unit on 22.01.2004. A back-up meter, being meter No. Datapro - 0111397, was also installed out side the premises of the applicant.

It is the contention of the applicant that the HT meter, being meter no. MSE-01754, was observed to be recording high consumption and hence, he communicated this to the Chief Engineer, MSEDCL, Nagpur vide his letter dated 08.02.2006. According to the applicant, the meter has recorded consumption of 1248220 units during the period from 20.12.2005 to 21.01.2006 which is very high and as per applicant's calculation, this consumption should not have been more than 8,00,000 units. He has produced a copy of letter dated 08.02.2006. He has also produced on record a copy of the energy bill dated 24.01.2006 for month of January, 2006. He added that the non-applicant did not take any cognizance of this letter and subsequently the energy meter recorded abnormally high consumption in the month of August, 2006. This fact was informed to MSEDCL i.e. the non-applicant vide his letter dated 13.08.2006. The applicant's representative has produced on record applicant's application dated 13.08.2006. The non-applicant replaced the applicant's meter, being meter no. MSE-01754 on 19.08.2006 and installed a new meter, being meter No. MSE-61628 without informing the applicant and without testing the old meter in the presence of the applicant or his authorised representative. The non-applicant also did not take any action of issuance of correct bills for the above period and on the contrary, issued excessive and

erroneous energy bill for August-2006 for 12,72,300 units. The non-applicant did not provide any justification for such an excessive energy bill and has violated the provisions of clause 15.4.1 of MERC (Electricity Supply Code & Other Conditions of Supply) Regulations, 2005 hereinafter referred to as the Supply Code Regulations. A copy of energy bill dated 31.08.2006 has been produced on record by the applicant's representative. The applicant protested this energy bill and informed the MSEDCL vide letter dt.4/9/06 (a copy produced on record) that the old energy meter has recorded about 40% excess consumption in the month of August 2006 for the period from 22.07.2006 to 22.08.2006. According to the applicant's representative, the actual consumption should have been around 7,00,000 units whereas the applicant was billed for 12,72,320 units for this period. The applicant further informed that his plant was under shut down for 10 days during this period. The applicant also requested the MSEDCL to test the meter and revise the disputed energy bill. The applicant further requested to verify the assessed consumption by comparing the same with the consumption shown by the additional meter installed outside the applicant's factory premises. The applicant requested the MSEDCL vide his letter dt. 11/9/2006 (a copy produced on record) that he has paid testing charges of the meter vide receipt No. 4625625 and again reminded the non-applicant that the meter has recorded excess consumption in February 2006 and also earlier in the month of September, 2005. The applicant further requested to refund the additional amount wrongly recovered due to faulty meter installed by MSEDCL. Thereupon, the MSEDCL

informed the applicant vide his letter dated 11.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) that the disputed meter shall be tested on 15.09.2006 at the laboratory of M/s. Secure Meters Ltd., Udaypur and requested him to depute his authorized representative to witness the test.

The applicant's representative added that on the applicant's request, the additional meter installed out side the premises of the applicant came to be tested by the Testing Division of MSEDCL and it was found to be Ok. The applicant, thereupon, requested the MSEDCL vide his letter dated 14.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) to revise his energy bill for the period from 22.07.2006 to 22.08.2006 based on the readings recorded by the additional meter. The applicant informed the non-applicant on 12.09.2006 vide his letter dated 12.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) that he was sending his representative to Udaipur for witnessing the test of the meter, being meter no. MSE-01754. He also reminded MSEDCL about his previous complaints dated 2/9/2005, 8/2/2006 and 13/8/2006 about recording faulty KWH consumption. He further requested the non-applicant to test the meter for the complete period from January, 2004.

The disputed meter was tested at the laboratory of the manufacture M/s. Secure Meters Ltd., Udaypur on 15/9/2006 and a MIR report was also retrieved. The applicant's representative was not satisfied with the test report and he put his remarks on the analysis report that the meter should be tested at some other place. The analysis report dated 15.09.2006 is available on record. The applicant requested the Superintending Engineer, NUC, MSEDCL,

Nagpur by his application dated 19.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) to get the meter tested by some third party since, according to him, the test report of M/s. Secure Meters Ltd. was incomplete and unsatisfactory.

The applicant's representative further submitted that it was not possible for the applicant to make payment of amount of Rs.71,77,586.54 of the erroneous energy bill, even under protest. He requested MSEDCL to permanently disconnect the power supply w.e.f. 19/9/2006 and that he would not pay even the minimum charges of next billing cycle. He further informed that he will not pay MSEDCL dues / bills till the excess billing problem is resolved. The Superintending Engineer, NUC, MSEDCL, Nagpur vide his letter no. 6915 dated 21.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) acknowledged receipt of the applicant's letter for permanent disconnection and informed him that one month's notice is necessary for termination of HT agreement and disconnection of HT supply and further that the permanent disconnection would be effective from 18.10.2006 and till that time the applicant will have to pay tariff minimum charges.

The Executive Engineer, MIDC Dn., MSEDCL vide his letter dated 26.09.2006 (a copy produced on record) communicated the applicant that the disputed meter tested at manufacturer's works is recording correctly in KWH registers but is recording high value in other registers because of failure of chip IC. He further suggested the applicant to inform him some names of testing laboratories in which the meter could be tested. The applicant, being not satisfied with the reply of the non-applicant and also with the manner in which the case was

being treated without considering the consumption recorded by the additional meter, sought information regarding the technical aspects of the case under the Right to Information Act, 2005. This information was furnished to him by the concerned Public Information Officer.

The applicant's representative added that the MSEDCL issued energy bill for September, 2006 for Rs.29,17,688.77 along with interest on arrears of Rs. 5890.09 and arrears of Rs. 71,69,534.99 totaling to Rs. 1,00,93,110.00.

The applicant paid wages & salaries amounting to Rs. 97,486 for the month of Sept.2006. Copies of the energy bill and statement of salary paid are produced on record by the applicant's representative.

Citing the above details, the applicant's representative strongly contended that the MSEDCL installed a faulty meter at the applicant's premises and that the manufacturer M/s. Secure Meters Limited had also brought to the notice of the testing Executive Engineer, MSEDCL, vide his letter No.085 dt. 14/4/2006 that the manufacturer is suspecting a component failure in the lot consisting of meter serial Nos. MSE-00500 to MSE-01850. The manufacturer had suggested the MSEDCL to replace all these meters. The applicant's disputed meter bearing Sr. No. MSE-01754 is from this defective lot. The MSEDCL did not take care and totally neglected the manufacturer's advice. The Executive Engineer, Testing Division (U) MSEDCL, Nagpur, vide letter No. 970 dt.26/5/2006, replied M/s. Secure Meters Ltd. expressing his inability to replace the lot of faulty meters for want of adequate stock.

The applicant's representative laid stress on Rule 57 of Indian Electricity Rules, 1956 which specifies that the meters placed upon consumers' premises shall be of appropriate capacity and shall be deemed to be correct if its limits of error are within the limits specified in the relevant Indian Standard Specifications and that the supplier shall examine, test and regulate all meters, maximum demand indicators and other apparatus for ascertaining the amount of energy supplied at such other intervals as may be directed by the State Govt. in this behalf. This rule also directs the supplier to maintain a register of meters showing the date of last test including the error in the meter and limits of accuracy after adjustment & final test. Relying on this provision, the applicant's representative stated that the non-applicant has violated all these provisions in the present case.

He further relied upon Regulation14.4.1 of the Supply Code Regulations which provides that the distribution licensee shall be responsible for the periodic testing and maintenance of all consumer meters. It is his contention that the Distribution Licensee has not performed its duty in this regard although it was well known to the licensee that the meter was defective.

The applicant's representative also quoted Central Electricity Authority (Installation and Operation of meters) Regulations, 2006 here-in-after referred to as CEA Regulations which have come into force on 17.03.2003. In that, he relied upon Regulations 9 (1),14 (2), 14 (3) and 15.2 thereof.

Regulation 9 (1) provides that the generating company or licensee, as the case may be, shall examine, test

and regulate all meters before installation and only correct meters shall be installed.

Regulation 14 pertains to meter reading and recording. It is laid down therein that it shall be the responsibility of the licensee to record metered data, maintain database of all the information associated with consumer meters and verify the correctness of metered data and that the licensee shall maintain accounts for the electricity consumption and other electrical quantities of its consumers. Brief history data of installation and details of testing, calibration and replacement of meters shall also the maintained by the licensee as per this Regulaion.

Regulation 14 (3) pertains to energy audit meters. In that, it shall be the responsibility of the generating company or licensee to record the metered data, maintain database of all the information associated with the energy accounting and audit meters and verify the correctness of metered data. Each generating company or licensee shall prepare quarterly, half-yearly and yearly energy account for its system for taking appropriate action for efficient operation and system development.

The applicant's representative relying on the above provisions strongly contended that the Distribution Licensee i.e. the non-applicant had not complied with the provisions of the CEA Regulations. He has also relied upon Regulation 15.2 in which it has been stated that the licensee shall take necessary steps as per the procedure given in the Electricity Supply Code of the appropriate Commission read with the notified conditions of the supply of electricity. This

Regulation further provides that in case the consumer reports to the licensee about consumer meter readings not commensurate with his consumption of electricity, stoppage of meter, damage to the seal, burning or damage of the meter, the licensee shall take necessary steps as per the procedures given in the Electricity Supply Code Regulations.

He also placed his reliance on Regulation 15.4 of the Supply Code Regulations and contended that the applicant's bill should have been adjusted for a maximum period of three months prior to the dispute raised by him in view of the fact that the applicant's meter was faulty. He reiterated that the applicant's tariff meter was declared defective by the manufacturer during the testing of the meter at its laboratory on 15/9/2006 and the manufacturer found that one chip IC has been failed. The manufacturer also found that the MD & KVAH registers were recording high consumption. The applicant's representative, however, did not agree with the manufacturer's remarks given in its analysis report that KWH counter of meter is recording correctly.

He further stated the retrieved data of meter shows a number of discrepancies in the consumptions recorded by the meter. On 12/8/2006 at 20.00 Hrs, on 14/8/06 at 3.30 Hrs, 5.00 Hrs, 7.00 Hrs, 8.30 Hrs, 10.00 Hrs, 14.30 Hrs, 16.00 Hrs, 17.30 Hrs, 19.00 Hrs, on dt. 15/8/06 at 1.30 Hrs, 3.00 hrs, 5.00 Hrs, and 8.00 Hrs, on dt. 17/8/06 at 9.00 Hrs, the KVA counter has recorded erroneous consumption which amounts to shoot up in the MD recorded by the meter. The KW reading does not tally with the KVA readings which is clear by observing recording on dt.17/8/2006 at 9.00 Hrs. The KVA

recorded is 425.4 and considering 20 as multiplying factor, this amounts to 8508 KVA which is impossible recording since the total connected load of the consumer is not more than 2400 KW. He strongly contended that the KW recorded during this period is zero which clearly indicates a problem with KW counter also.

The applicant is regularly recording consumption details in the prescribed G-7 form. The applicant's representative has produced on record a copy of this form. Relying on the entries recorded in the natural course of business in this form, the applicant's representative stated that the readings of G-7 show that during the period of one day i.e. 12/8/06 to 13/8/06, the KWH counter has recorded consumption of 1760371-1737041 = 23330 and considering MF of 20, the applicant's consumption in one day recorded by the meter comes to 466600 KWH units. If load which can be consumed by these units in one day is calculated, it comes to 19441.6 KW. This clearly indicates that the meter has recorded erroneous KWH. He added that the meter has not only recorded erroneous KWH consumption but it has also recorded in the wrong slot i.e. in Zone "D" when tariff rates are the highest. He further stated that the energy bill of August 2006 is showing consumption of 739380 KWH units in "D" zone which is are of 4 hrs. in a day only. The meter has recorded 138180 KWH units in "A" zone i.e. during 8 hrs; 294780 in "B" zone which is on 9 hrs. and it recorded consumption of 99580 KWH units in "C" Zone which is of 3 hours. Citing these details, he vehemently argued that the meter had recorded erroneous readings in different slots and

in particular, it recorded highly incorrect reading in Zone "D". The applicant's consumption in zone "D" is ranging between 1.3 lacs to 2 lacs units from the date of installation. There are 120 hours of zone "D" in a month and consumption of 739380 KWH corresponds to per hour consumption of 739380 /120 = 6161 KWH. This, according to him, shows that erroneous reading was recorded in Kwh counter of the meter.

He further pointed out that the Executive Engineer, Testing Division, vide his letter dated 20.09.2006 addressed to M/s. Secure Meters Ltd., raised a question on the testing of disputed meter and commented that "From the analysis report, it is gathered that meter chip IC has failed, MD & KVAH registers have recorded erratically & KWH register recorded correctly. During witnessing the testing, the undersigned had pointed out possibility of recording of export KWH consumption & its effects on total KWH import. But it was denied by stating that there are separate registers for import & export KWH consumption recording from the data retrieved & printouts of main energy register consumption (History) during reset to reset & from history 05-06 to 01-02 i.e up to last reset before replacement of meter WH(E) & WH(E) total have been shown as O.K. But in History of 00-01 i.e. current reading up to the replacement of meter the parameters have been recorded as below.

WH(1)	WH(E)	WH(E)TOTAL	WH(1) TOTAL
35097 k	25500 k	5376 k	61026 k

Considering the arithmetic equation it seems that WH(1) + WH(E) – WH(E)Total = WH(1) TOTAL (nearly equal)

In view of this, it is requested to offer your detailed comments how history 00-01 is found to be recorded in such a disturbed manner".

Citing these remarks, he contended that they clearly indicate that KWH register of the meter had recorded erroneous readings.

He further contended that the back-up additional meter installed by the licensee was also tested by the testing Engineer of MSEDCL on 05.09.2006 and the same was found to be working satisfactorily. It is his strong submission that the additional meter should have been considered for assessing the consumption of applicant since the tariff meter was from a defective lot and it was also found to be defective on testing. He does not agree with the comments of the manufacturer that the KWH counter was recording correctly. He also stated that once any counter of any meter or any part of the meter is declared faulty, the meter cannot be said to be a correct meter for tariff metering since it does not satisfy the specifications of correct provided in Indian Electricity Rules, 1956 and CEA Regulations.

The applicant's representative has submitted a comparative statement of consumption shown by the tariff meter and the additional meter w.e.f. 21.10.2005. He submitted that during the period from 21.10.2005 upto 21.09.2006, the tariff meter has recorded 4,58,280 units more than those recorded by the additional meter. This difference is of 4,26,720 units particularly in the month of August, 2006

The applicant's representative further brought to our notice that there were negative T & D losses in the

following months as evidenced by the energy audit data of the 11 KV express feeder.

January 2004	-	(-) 1.96%
April 2004	-	(-) 0.55%
September 2004	-	(-) 0.57%
April 2005	-	(-) 2.45%
June 2005	-	(-) 5.4%
April 2006	-	(-) 7.4%
August 2006	-	(-) 25.68%

According to him, the negative losses recorded by the audit meters of the feeder were due to excess consumption recorded by consumer meter on that feeder. Particularly in month of August 2006, there is a negative loss of (-) 25.68% and in the same month the applicant's tariff meter had recorded 426720 excess units as compared to the additional meter. He continued to say that feeder data of the month of August 2006 confirms the applicant's claim of excess and erroneous consumption having been recorded by the tariff meter.

He further contended that the licensee did not test the defective meter prior to removal and has not informed the consumer of its intentions. This act of licensee is totally unjustified and illegal. He has cited a ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Belwal Spinning Mills Ltd. Etc. V/s. U.P. State Electricity Board and another in Civil Appeal No. 4401-08 of 1997. It is held therein that". . . . . although the licensee is clothed with the power to maintain a correct meter installed at the applicant's premises and for such purpose enter the premises of the consumer and the licensee can also repair or alter the meter and other electrical

apparatus if found defective on checking or testing by the licensee, but if the dispute as to the correct status of the meter is raised by the licensee or by the consumer by making a reference to the Electrical Inspector under-section 26 (6), then such a dispute can be determined only by the Electrical Inspector and the meter or apparatus cannot also be changed by the licensee unless the dispute is resolved. . . . . "

Relying on this, the applicant's representative strongly contended that the applicant should not have changed his meter unless and until the dispute in this respect was resolved.

The non-applicant has submitted his parawise comments and replies on 22.11.2006. His first contention is that the applicant's letter dated 08.02.2006 was not at all received by the office of the Superintending Engineer, NUC. He strongly contended that the applicant never informed in February, 2006 that the applicant's tariff meter had been recording excess units. He has, during the course of hearing, termed the intimation dated 08.02.2006 as false. He, however, admitted that the applicant's subsequent complaint dated 13.08.2006 on the subject of faulty tariff meter was duly received on 14.08.2006. Thereupon, the Executive Engineer concerned personally visited the applicant's premises on 14.08.2006 and observed that the KVA MD and KVAH counters did record abnormal consumption. This matter was also verified from G-7 form maintained by the applicant. The matter was, thereupon, referred to the Executive Engineer, Testing Division on 18.08.2006. The Testing Engineer checked the meter and recorded the existing parameters such as

voltage current and phase sequence. It was observed that M.D. recorded in "D" shift was on higher side. The KWH and KVAH parameters were also not found tallying with each other. The applicant's tariff meter was thereupon replaced immediately by providing a new meter, being meter no. MSE-61628. All the process since the entries of Testing Engineer and others till the replacement of meter and sealing of meter equipment was carried out in the applicant's representative's (one Shri Rajesh Shrivastav) presence who has already signed on the report of HT meter testing at the same time on 19.08.2006. No objection of any kind was raised at this point of time by the applicant's representative on the issue of either testing of old meter or replacement by a new meter.

He has given a statement in his written reply showing yearwise monthwise consumption of the applicant's Unit from August, 2005 to July, 2006. The applicant had also paid all his energy bills without raising any objection. The only complaint that was received in respect of excessive bill was that of August, 2006. It is his say that the bill for August, 2006 was calculated on the basis of readings of the old and new meter during the month. He has given relevant details of KWH readings pertaining to the applicant's old tariff meter and the new one. Appropriate incentive was also given in the energy bill for August, 2006 in respect of readings of old and new meter for KWH and the applicant did not take any objection thereto.

He added that as per Regulation 15.4.1 of the Supply Code Regulations, due to MD shoot up problem in August, 2006, the bill amount was calculated on the basis of

available maximum MD recorded during the last three months. In his first parawise report dated 22.11.2006, he has also stated that the bill issued to the consumer for August, 2006 was correct and proper.

He added that because of the applicant's complaint dated 04.09.2006 regarding excess energy bill in respect of the applicant's old tariff meter, being meter no. MSE-01754 for the period from 22.07.2006 to 19.08.2006, this meter came to be tested at the manufacture's works at Udaypur on 15.09.2006 in the presence of the applicant's representative. The analysis report does not show any abnormal behavour of KWH counter. The test report clearly makes a mention that recording of consumption in KWH counter was correct. He admitted that the other registers i.e. KVA and KVAH registers have recorded high values because of the chip I.C. failure. He mentioned that question of revision of the applicant's energy bill of August, 2006 does not arise because of correct recording in KWH register. In his parawise report, he has further stated that the other meter installed outside the applicant's factory premises was only for cross checking consumption and that there is no provision for billing the applicant based on the consumption shown by such a check meter. He further stated that the energy bill for the month of February, 2006 for 11,24,500 units amounting to Rs. 39,18,280/- and also the energy bill for the month of September, 2005 for 12,33,140 units amounting to Rs.45,26,423=92 were duly paid by the applicant without raising any protest at relevant time. He assertively stated that none of his offices has received any complaint regarding

excessive consumption in February, 2006 and earlier also in September, 2005.

The non-applicant added that he was ready to get applicant's disputed tariff meter tested by a third party and that the applicant himself has given a letter dated 19.09.2006 requesting for getting his tariff meter tested by some third party. In response to this letter, the MSEDCL, by its letter dated 26.09.2006, intimated the applicant relevant details of approved laboratories where the disputed meter can be tested as per applicant's convenience. The applicant was also reminded by him by his letter dated 10.10.2006 by registered post acknowledgement due. This letter was returned back to him un-delivered. A second reminder was also sent on 14.11.2006 but till date the applicant's confirmation of third party testing has not been received.

He has admitted in his parawise report dated 22.11.2006 that the applicant has given one month's notice for termination of HT agreement and disconnection of HT supply and that the applicant was informed that permanent disconnection would be affective from 18.10.2006 and further that that applicant has to pay tariff minimum charges till this date i.e. till 18.10.2006. The H.T. supply of the applicant was temporarily disconnected on 21.09.2006. The revised stand taken by the non-applicant is that permanent disconnection can not be made effective unless and until the applicant clears the arrears / dues of the energy bills of the said connection. Hence, permanent disconnection has not been made effective.

He added that the HT energy bill for the billing month of September, 2006 for Rs.29,17,688/- alongwith interest and arrear of Rs. 71,69,534=99 has been issued to the applicant as per procedure in force.

On the point of award of compensation, the non-applicant's contention is that the applicant's H.T. connection was permanently disconnected because of the applicant's own request and as such MSEDCL is not legally bound to pay any compensation as claimed by the applicant.

On the point of periodical checking or testing of the applicant's tariff meter in question, the say of the non-applicant is that the disputed tariff meter was duly tested on 03.12.2004 before it was installed at the applicant's premises. The Testing Engineer also visited the applicant's premises for carrying out necessary testing of the meter on 27.07.2005 and 10.10.2005 but the testing could not be done due to having no load and due to shutdown of the factory.

According to him, the KWH counter of the meter was not defective. He also stated during the course of hearing that energy bills were raised on the basis of consumption as indicated by the KWH counter and that even if the other registers like KVA & KVAH of the meter were not working properly, his energy bills issued cannot be said to be erroneous or improper so long as the KWH counter was in order.

On the maintenance of necessary records, the non-applicant's submission is that, as laid down in Regulation 14 (2) of the Central Electricity Authority Regulations, the Company has been duly maintaining accounts for the

electricity consumption and also fulfilling all the other requirements of these Regulations.

He added that every possible action was taken in respect of the applicant's grievance immediately after receipt of his complaint dated 13.08.2006 and in that, after due checking etc. the applicant's disputed tariff meter was replaced by a new meter on 19.08.2006.

On the point of alleged faultiness of the disputed meter, it is the contention of the non-applicant that the KWH counter of the meter was quite in order and that failure of chip I.C. component of KVA counter has not adversely affected the working of KWH counter.

In his first parawise report he has mentioned that the energy bill for the month of August, 2006 was calculated on the basis of actual KWH consumption recorded by meter No. MSE-01754 up to 19.08.2006 and by the new meter, being meter no. MSE-61628 upto 22.08.2006 and that the electricity bill issued for August, 2006 was in order. On the point of billing the applicant on the basis of the other meter, the non-applicant has stated that there is no provision in the Supply Code Regulations for issuance of electricity bill on the basis of any such check meter.

As regards the applicant's submission in respect of energy audit data of the 11KV feeder emerging from Hingna-II S/stn., the non-applicant vehemently contended that this 11KV feeder is not a dedicated feeder only meant for the applicant's usage of electricity. This feeder is catering the load for as many as 22 HT consumers and 37 LT consumers. He has produced on record a detailed list of all such consumers.

Moreover, the energy audit of this meter was not always on the negative side. He stressed by saying that the T&D loss was on the positive site intermittently during the 25 months' period between February, 2004 and July, 2006. He has given a tabular statement year wise month wise in his first written submission showing that the T&D losses were on positive side during this period of 25 months. It is his contention that the applicant's claim in this respect is of no consequence and it is also not a conclusive proof to substantiate such a claim.

Both the parties have also submitted additional written statements in support of their respective claims. They are taken on record.

The non-applicant in his additional submission dated 14.12.2006 has stated that the MSEDCL has not violated any provisions of Indian Electricity Rules 1956, CEA Regulations & Supply Code Regulations. He has further stated that the other back-up meter installed at the applicant's premises cannot be said to be a check meter in terms of Regulations 2 (1) of the CEA Regulations since this meter was not connected to the same core of current transformer (CT) and Voltage transformer (VT) to which the main meter was connected. Hence, the other meter cannot be considered for billing purpose. On this point, the contention of the applicant's representative is that the other meter referred to by the non-applicant is not a check meter. But it is an additional meter installed for recording electricity consumed by the applicant and for the purpose of ascertaining the exact quantum of electricity supplied to the applicant or the number of hrs. during which supply is given. This other meter,

according to him, is an additional meter in terms of Regulation 19 of the CEA Regulations and it is not a check meter. He further stressed this point by saying that this additional meter was not placed otherwise than between the distribution mains of the licensee and the tariff meter.

The applicant has filed a re-jointer dated 27.12.2006 replying the non-applicant's written submission dated 19.12.2006. In that, he has given a statement monthwise showing the energy recorded in "D" zone in KWH Register from December, 2005 to September, 2006. This statement reveals that during the period from December, 2005 to July, 2006, the energy recorded in "D" zone was ranging between 1,45,340 and 1,91,080 units. It was 1,24,180 units in September, 2006 while in August, 2006 it has recorded 7,39,780 units. Quoting this pattern of consumption the contention of the applicant is that energy recorded in "D" zone in the month of August, 2006 is clearly erroneous.

He further stated that the disputed meter was faulty resulting into erroneous display of 739780 KWH units in "D" zone in the energy bill dated 31.08.2006. According to him, excess consumption of 623178 units has been shown in "D" zone by the applicant's disputed meter.

Both the parties during the course of hearing have furnished day wise retrieved data of the applicant's disputed tariff meter from 21.07.2006 to 19.08.2006.

There is no dispute regarding quantum of consumption shown by the replaced meter, being meter No. MSE-61628.

The non-applicant has submitted his reply dated 27.12.2006 giving pointwise comments in reply to the additional submission made by the applicant on 19.12.2006. The same points as are mentioned earlier were repeated by the non-applicant in this reply.

On the point of termination of agreement after giving a notice of 30 days in terms of Regulation 6.6 of the Supply Code Regulations, the non-applicant's submission is that permanent disconnection could not be effected due to non-payment of the outstanding arrear dues by the applicant and that as per Regulation 6.5, the Distribution Licensee has a right for recovery of any amount due under the agreement before permanent disconnection. The non-applicant has also furnished & relied upon a statement showing zonewise consumption for the disputed meter, being meter no. MSE-01754 and another for the additional meter for the same period from 21.07.2006 to 19.08.2006.

Commenting upon these two statements, the applicant's representative strongly contended that the consumption recorded in "D" zone of the disputed meter is now shown to be 123018 units while the additional meter is shown to have recorded 19330 units in "D" zone in billing month of August, 2006 upto 19.08.2006. He assertively stated that the non-applicant has now reversed its earlier stand and admitted that the current energy bill dated 31.08.2006 had wrongly shown consumption of 739780 units in "D" zone during the month of August, 2006 and also that there are now corresponding changes shown in respect of in the "A", "B", and "C" zones also. The total consumption in KWH

counter shown as 12,72,320 units in the disputed bill is now reduced to 8,61,352 units by the non-applicant. He, therefore, stressed that there is a need to further analyse the retrieved data of the disputed meter and also to draw a comparison with the quantities of retrieved data of the additional meter.

During the course of last leg of hearing, both the parties agreed to come forward with a joint statement of the reconciled figures of consumption so as to come to a final conclusion in respect of exact quantum of consumption in terms of units zone wise for the month of August, 2006 i.e. from 22.07.2006 to 19.08.2006. This exercise was jointly done by both the parties and ultimately a joint statement showing zonewise consumption for the disputed meter as revealed by the retrieved computerized data from 22.07.2006 to 19.08.2006 and duly signed by the both the parties and also by the Superintending Engineer, NUC, MSEDCL, Nagpur came to be submitted to the Forum on 15.01.2007. Both the parties have now fully agreed that the applicant's consumption during the month of August upto 19.08.2006 against the applicant's disputed tariff meter was 7,92,924 units and its break-up zone wise is as under.

"A" zone		2,94,782 units.
"B" zone		2,83,100 units.
"C" zone		98,440 units
"D" zone		1,16,602 units
	Total :--	7,92,924 units.

The undisputed consumption revealed by the new meter from 19.08.2006 to 22.08.2006 is as under. Total consumption 51740 units. Its Zonewise distribution is as under.:

"A" zone -- 29,580 units

"B" zone -- 9,740 units

"C" zone -- 1,220 units

"D" zone -- 11,200 units

Total :- 51,740 units.

Thus the quantum consumption now agreed to by both the parties for the period from 22.07.2006 to 22.08.2006 is as under.

"A" zone	3,24,362 units
"B" zone	2,92,840 units
"C" zone	99,660 units
"D" zone	1,27,802 units
Total :-	8,44,664 units.

The applicant's grievance regarding exact quantum of consumption particularly for the month of August, 2006 thus stands resolved in as much as both the parties after detailed study and analysis of the retrieved data of the two meters finally agreed to the above figures of consumption.

This Forum also holds that the other back-up meter, being meter No. 0111397 was an additional meter and not a check meter.

In view of this position, the applicant's current energy bill dated 31.08.2006 for the month of August, 2006 for 12,72,320 units stands quashed and in its place, a revised

current bill for 844664 total units will have to be issued by the non-applicant. The zone-wise distribution agreed to by both the parties is as shown above. Based on this, the non-applicant is directed to issue a fresh current bill for the month of August, 2006.

It is pertinent to note that both the parties have categorically stated before us that retrieval of computerized data of the additional meter is also showing exactly identical details of slot wise consumption as stated above the month of August, 2006 i.e. from 22.07.2006 to 19.08.2006.

It is proved that there was an error or fault in the display of the disputed tariff meter during the month of August, 2006 and also that the registration of consumption in the KWH counter of the disputed tariff meter was fault-free. There is no doubt that the KVA and KVAH registers had recorded high consumption values and that one chip I.C. failure was noticed during the course of manufacture's testing and further that the chip I.C. failure did not have any adverse effect on the KWH registration counter.

The applicant's representative had submitted in his grievance application a statement showing consumption of tariff meter and the additional meter. This comparison is for the period from 21.10.2005 upto 21.09.2006.

The net difference between the total number of units shown to be consumed as per the disputed tariff meter for the month of August, 2006 and the number of units actually consumed as revealed by KWH registration counter of the meter comes to 1272320 – 844664 = 427656. Hence, the original contention of the applicant that the disputed tariff

meter had displayed erroneous and excess consumption of more than 400000 units in the month of August, 2006 is correct.

The applicant's representative has given another statement showing energy recorded by the disputed tariff meter in "D" zone in Kwh during the period from December, 2005 to September, 2006. The applicant's contention based on this statement is that energy recorded in "D" zone in Kwh counter was ranging between 1,45,340 units and 1,91,080 units between December, 2005 and July, 2006. The energy recorded in "D" zone in Kwh counter in September, 2006 is 1,24,180 units while in August, 2006 the display is 7,39,780 units. Based on this statical data the contention of the applicant was that the energy recorded in "D" zone in the month of August, 2006 is clearly erroneous. Now as per the joint statement dated 15.01.2007 filed before us it is seen that the energy recorded in "D" zone in August, 2006 comes to 127802 units. Hence, it follows that the registration of consumption in KWH counter has been correct and proper through out.

All the other points raised by the applicant in his written submissions in the context of the disputed current energy bill for August, 2006 dated 31.08.2006 do not now survive. The applicant is fully satisfied about the revision of this current bill as stated above.

The above position fully and satisfactorily answers the second prayer made by the applicant in his grievance application in respect of his current energy bill for the month of August, 2006. The applicant's grievance was no doubt quite

genuine. Hence, we direct the non-applicant to revise the applicant's current energy bill for the month of August, 2006 as per joint statement dated 15.01.2007 furnished before this Forum on 15.01.2007.

The applicant in his first prayer of the grievance application has requested this Forum to issue an interim order under Regulation 8.3 of the said Regulations directing the non-applicant to refund excess amount charged along with interest for consumption of 4,58,280 units being the difference in the consumption recorded by the disputed tariff meter and consumption of additional meter for the period from 31.10.2005 till date considering this excess consumption to be consumption of slot "D' i.e. 18 hrs. to 22 hrs.

In this respect, the applicant's contention is that he had filed his first complaint dated 08.02.2006 addressed to the Chief Engineer NUZ, Nagpur on the subject of showing of excess units by his meter. He has also produced on record a copy of this application. This copy bears a stamp of receipt clerk of MSEDCL, NUC, Nagpur and a short signature of receipt clerk in token of having received this application or complaint. The non-applicant, on his part, submits that no such application was either made by the applicant or was ever received in his office. He further submits that no date is put by the receiving person on this application. According to him, the applicant is trying to make believe that the non-applicant had received such an application. He emphatically denied receipt of any such application.

We find a reason to believe the submission made by the non-applicant in as much as no corroborating proof was

produced by the applicant to convincingly prove that such an application was duly made and was received by the MSEDCL. Moreover, the Forum observes that the applicant has been paying all his energy bills up to July, 2006 without raising any protest in respect of defectiveness of his tariff meter. It is also seen that no follow-up after 08.02.2006 was made by the applicant till submission of the another application dated 13.08.2006 addressed to the Executive Engineer MSEDCL, MIDC Hingna Road, Nagpur, which is admitted to be received on 14.08.2006 by the non-applicant. This second application nowhere makes a mention of the applicant's earlier application dated 08.02.2006. In view of this position, it is difficult to believe that any such application being application dated 08.02.2006 was ever made by the applicant raising his dispute about his tariff meter showing excess units. According to us, the first such complaint about faultiness of the tariff meter came to be filed by the applicant on 13.08.2006 which was duly received by the non-applicant on 14.08.2006.

It is also pertinent to mention here that an arrear amount of Rs.87,70,750 was outstanding against the applicant at the end of the billing month of April, 2006 as revealed by record. A package was, therefore, proposed by the Chief Engineer, NUZ, Nagpur to the H.O. MSEDCL, Mumbai for recovering this arrear amount in installments. This package was approved by the H.O. on 05.05.2006. The point that needs to be mentioned here is that the applicant did not make any mention of his alleged complaint application dated 08.02.2006 and did not raise any dispute about current bills amounts for the months of February, March and April, 2006 while

requesting for grant of installments for payment of outstanding amount of Rs.87,70,500 vide his application dated 03.05.2006. Absence of making such a mention falsifies the stand now taken by the applicant that he had made a complaint on 08.02.2006 about the allegedly erroneous and excess consumption of his disputed tariff meter.

It is also an admitted position now that the consumption registered by the Kwh counter by the disputed tariff meter and the consumption recorded by the additional meter was exactly identical. In view of this position, the applicant's request for refunding the excess amount charged along with interest for consumption of 458280 excess units from 31.10.2005 till date cannot be fully accepted by us. What is permitted in this case is refund of excess amount charged for 427656 units only as against 4,58,280 as already held by us above.

As per the joint statement duly signed by both the parties and furnished before this Forum, the applicant's consumption in "D" zone for the month of August, 2006 i.e. for the period from 22.02.2006 to 22.08.2006 is 1,27,802 units as against 7,39,786 units displayed wrongly by the applicant's tariff meter. The applicant has been held by us to be entitled to get refund for excess amount charged for 611984 units in "D" zone against this background. The applicant had requested for refund of excess amount charged for consumption of 458280 units in "D" zone. Hence, it follows that the applicant is getting relief for 611984 units as against 458280 units prayed for by the applicant. The applicant's first prayer is, therefore, adequately taken care of by this Forum.

The applicant in the third prayer of his grievance application has sought a direction from this Forum that the non-applicant should submit slot-wise record of readings of additional meter including M.D. recorded from the date of installation of the additional meter. This Forum observes that there is now no need to obtain such a record from the date of installation in view of the fact that the applicant's grievance in respect of excess billing is resolved to the satisfaction of the applicant. Moreover, the data recorded by the additional meter beyond three months' period is not retrievable, the additional meter being a data-pro meter. Even otherwise also, it has been proved that the applicant's energy consumption registered by the KWH counter of the tariff meter exactly tallies with the consumption shown by the additional meter. This prayer is, therefore, of no consequence now.

The fourth prayer made in the applicant's grievance application is regarding issuance of a final order directing the non-applicant to refund the excess amount charged to the applicant along with interest for difference in slotwise consumption and M.D. recorded by the faulty tariff meter and the additional meter from the date of installation. The applicant's disputed current energy bill for month of August, 2006 is already quashed by us, it being erroneous and excessive. A direction is also given by us to issue a revised current bill for the month of August, 2006 as per the joint statement dated 15.01.2007 furnished by both the parties.

The computerized data of the

tariff meter and that of the additional meter beyond a period of six months and three months respectively also cannot be retrieved. Hence, the question of granting relief from the date of installation of meter does not arise. It is in fact of no consequence now.

The applicant has given a comparative statement in his written submission showing comparison of consumption shown by his tariff meter and additional meter. In that, it has been mentioned that the applicant's total Kwh consumption as revealed by the additional meter was 11564500 units from 21.10.2005 to 21.09.2006 while his disputed tariff meter was showing total Kwh consumption of 12022780 units during the same period. The contention of the applicant based on this comparative statement is that his tariff meter recorded excessive consumption of 458280 units during the above period. He has, therefore, requested in his grievance application to refund the excess amount charged along with interest for this excess quantum of 458280 units. The comparative statement indicates that, according to the applicant, excess consumption of 426720 units was recorded only in one month i.e. the month of August, 2006. It is now proved that because of the fault developed in the display of KWH counter of the applicant's disputed tariff meter, excess consumption of 4,27,656 units was erroneously displayed during the month of August, 2006. Hence, out of the applicant's claim of excessive consumption of 458280 units, the dispute regarding 427656 units stands settled. The non-applicant has also agreed to withdraw energy bill for 427656 units in totality so far as the current bill for the month

of August, 2006 is concerned. The zone-wise Distribution has also been worked out and agreed to by both the parties. Hence, now question of 458280 - 427656 = 30624 units only remains to be looked into. If this figure of 30624 units is compared with the total KWH consumption of the disputed meter over a period of past about one year, the percentage error is very meager and it is within permissible limits. Question of refund of excess amount charged since the date of installation of the meter, therefore does not survive now.

The applicant has prayed in the fifth prayer of his grievance application that the MSEDCL be directed to compensate the applicant's direct losses like salary of staff, interest paid to the Bank during the closer period from 19.09.2006. The non-applicant's say on this point is that it was the applicant who had requested for permanent disconnection of his power supply w.e.f. 19.09.2006. This fact is also admitted by the applicant's representative. According to the applicant, it was not possible for him to make payment of current bill amount of Rs.7177586=54 for the energy bill of August, 2006 based on the disputed meter's recorded consumption even under protest and hence, he requested MSEDCL to permanently disconnect his supply.

We do not see any reason in the argument advanced by the applicant's representative in this respect. It is a matter of record that the energy bill for month of August, 2006 also contained an arrear amount of Rs.5152359=83. This

arrear amount is pertaining to the past current bill amounts of the applicant. It is also a matter of record that the applicant did not liquidate the entire arrear amount payable by him till recently. Despite this position, the applicant's power supply was never proposed to be disconnected by the non-applicant in terms of section 56 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003. The permanent disconnection was earlier proposed to be made effective w.e.f. 18.10.2006 only on the applicant's own request for permanent disconnection of his power supply. The non-applicant, therefore, can, by no stretch of imagination, be held responsible for permanent disconnection of the applicant's power supply. The reasoning given by the applicant in this respect is not at all cogent and convincing. It cannot lie in the mouth of the applicant to make a request for award of compensation because of permanent disconnection of his power supply when it was he himself who made a request to the non-applicant for disconnecting his power supply. The question of award of compensation, therefore, does not arise at all. The applicant was free to continue running of his factory keeping aside his dispute about the current bill amount for August, 2006. Nobody prevented him from running his factory. His request for award of compensation, therefore, stands rejected.

The last prayer i.e. the sixth prayer made by the applicant is that the non-applicant be directed to withdraw tariff minimum bills beyond 19.09.2006 till the supply is reconnected.

The applicant's representative relied upon Regulation 6.5 of the Supply Code Regulations which lays down that the agreement shall be deemed to be terminated

upon permanent disconnection of the consumer or where the consumer remains disconnected for a period of more than six months. Provided that the termination of agreement is without prejudice to the rights of Distribution Licensee or of the consumer under the Act for recovery of any amounts due under the agreement. Regulation 6.6 provides that a consumer may terminate the agreement after giving a notice of thirty days to the Distribution Licensee.

The non-applicant's submission is that there was an arrear amount outstanding against the applicant and as such tariff minimum bills are being issued despite permanent disconnection of the applicant's power supply. The non-applicant laid stressed on the provision of Regulation 6.5 that the termination of agreement is without prejudice to his rights under the Act for recovery of any amount due under the agreement.

It is a matter of record that the applicant gave a notice dated 19.09.2006 to the non-applicant for permanent disconnection of his power supply. It is also a matter of record that the Superintending Engineer, NUC, MSEDCL, Nagpur by his letter, being letter no. 6915 dated 21.09.2006, informed the applicant that the permanent disconnection will be effective from 18.10.2006 and further that he will have to pay tariff minimum charges till the date of permanent disconnection i.e. till 18.10.2006. However, the permanent disconnection was not made effective from 18.10.2006 and the Superintending Engineer subsequently informed the applicant by his letter, being letter no. 8051 dated 14.11.2006, that unless the arrear amount is cleared by the applicant, the

permanent disconnection will not be made effective. The plea taken by the non-applicant is that the applicant is liable to pay the tariff minimum charges despite permanent disconnection until the arrear amount outstanding against him is paid. A total arrear amount of Rs.1,08,33,140 is shown to be outstanding against him in his letter dated 14.11.2006.

The stand taken by the non-applicant is not acceptable to us for the reason that Regulation 6.5 of the Supply Code Regulations clearly lays down that the agreement shall be deemed to be terminated upon permanent disconnection of the consumer after the consumer gives a notice of 30 days to the Distribution Licensee. The civil right to recover any amount outstanding against the consumer is always protected by these Regulations even after permanent disconnection or termination of the agreement. The words "termination of agreement is without prejudice to right the Distribution Licensee under the Act for recovery of any amount due under the agreement" refers to Distribution Licensee's right under section 56 (1) of the Electricity Act, 2003 wherein it has been laid down that the Licensee has a right to recover any such outstanding amount by filing a Civil suit in the appropriate Court of Law.

During the course of hearing, the applicant's representative has produced on record a copy of corrected, Conditions of Supply of MSEDCL which has been corrected & forwarded to the non-applicant by the MERC under its letter, being letter no. 1912 dated 18.09.2006 addressed to the Managing Direction, MSEDCL.

The applicant's representative drew our attention to clauses 17.2 of this corrected version of conditions which provide that a consumer may terminate the agreement after giving a notice of 30 days to the MSEDCL. This line has been added by MERC since it was not in the draft of MSEDCL. The MERC has also totally deleted clause 17.5.7 of the original draft submitted by the MSEDCL which stated that MSEDCL shall terminate the agreement of power supply on consumer's request only after the consumer has paid total dues (including arrears) within 15 days thereafter. Otherwise, the agreement shall be deemed to continue & to be in force. He laid stress on this deletion and vehemently argued that this clearly specifies that even if there is an arrear amount outstanding against the consumer, the agreement shall be terminated after expiry of the notice period. He further contended that the act MSEDCL of not terminating the agreement and issuing the tariff minimum energy bills to the applicant has violated the direction given by the MERC.

We are fully convinced of the stand taken by the applicant's representative particularly in view of the corrected conditions of Supply of MSEDCL and the interpretation of Regulations 6.5 and 6.6. of the Supply Code Regulations.

It is pertinent to note that no comment has been made by the non-applicant before us in this regard.

In the light of above position, it is crystal clear that MSEDCL's act of non-termination of agreement on the ground of outstanding arrear amount despite service of thirty days' notice on MSEDCL is not correct and legal. The non-applicant is bound to terminate the agreement w.e.f.

18.10.2006 i.e. on the date of expiration of 30 days' notice period. Consequently, the act of non-applicant of issuing tariff minimum bill beyond 18.10.2006 is also not correct and legal. The applicant's request in this respect deserves to be granted.

We, therefore, direct the non-applicant to withdraw all the tariff minimum bills of the applicant issued beyond 18.10.2006. This direction is issued by us without prejudice to the non-applicant's right of recovery of arrears amount outstanding against the applicant under the Act.

All other points raised in this matter do not survive now.

We thus allow the applicant's grievance application partly and the same stands disposed in terms of this order.

The non-applicant shall report compliance of this order to this Forum on or before 28.02.2007.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(S.J. Bhargawa)	**(Smt. Gauri Chandrayan)**	**(S.D. Jahagirdar)**
Member-Secretary	MEMBER	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