

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/154 /2006

Applicant : Smt. Shakuntala Shankarrao Barde
Plot No. 19, Vivekanand Nagar,
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : MSEDCL represented by
the Nodal Officer-
Executive Engineer,
Congress Nagar 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 31.10.2006)

The present grievance application has been filed on
10.10.2006 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 excessive and erroneous energy bill amounting to Rs.12,690/- issued on 23.05.2006 for 2354 units.

Before approaching this Forum the applicant had filed her complaint on the same subject-matter of the grievance before the Internal Grievance Redressal Cell (in short the Cell) on 04.08.2006 under the said Regulations. The Cell, upon enquiry, informed the applicant by its letter, being letter no. 6786 dated 15.09.2006, that the disputed energy bill in question cannot be revised since the applicant's meter was found to be alright upon its testing. It is against this decision of the Cell that the applicant has filed the present grievance application.

The matter was heard by us on 27.10.2006 and 30.10.2006. The applicant's case was presented before this Forum by one Shri Abhijit Prabhakar Athawale as her nominated representative

The Nodal Officer Shri Ganguli, Executive Engineer, Congressnagar Division, MSEDCL, NUZ, Nagpur presented the case of the non-applicant Company.

It is the contention of the applicant's representative that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 189233, had recorded excessive and erroneous consumption of as many as 2354 units only in a month's period and as a result of that, excessive energy bill amounting to Rs.12,690/- came to be issued to her on 23.05.2006. He added that the applicant's per month consumption for previous five months was 138,

100,103, 195 and 455 units respectively from December, 2005 to April, 2006. Thus, the applicant's meter had shown almost 15 to 20 times more consumption in the billing month of May, 2006 which in itself shows that the behavior of the applicant's meter was faulty and erratic. On receipt of the disputed energy bill, the applicant filed her objection through letter dated 09.05.2006 but her grievance was not redressed. On the contrary on 27.05.2006, the erroneous meter was replaced by a new meter.

The applicant's representative strongly contended that the consumption shown by the new meter also reveals that the applicant's monthly consumption never exceeded 240 units.

He added that the quantum of energy bill amounts charged to the applicant was only Rs.570/- Rs. 710/- and Rs.2060/- during three months immediately preceding the period of the disputed energy bill.

On the point of the applicant's meter testing, the contention of the applicant's representative is that testing of the applicant's meter at the meter testing Unit of Congressnagar Division, NUZ, Nagpur was not done in the presence of the applicant. He has, therefore, disputed the meter testing report dated 15.06.2006 produced on record by the non-applicant. It is his submission that no load test was carried out of the applicant's meter and that the meter testing report relied upon by the non-applicant is too inadequate to conclude that the applicant's meter was ok.

He lastly prayed that the disputed energy bill in question may be revised appropriately considering the usual monthly consumption pattern of the applicant as evidenced by metered readings previous to May, 2006 and also by the new meter.

The non-applicant, on his part, has stated in his parawise report that the applicant's meter, being meter no. 189233, was duly tested in the testing Unit of his Division on 15.06.2006 and the meter was found to be Ok. The energy bill disputed by the applicant was rightly issued and nothing wrong has happened in the instance case. According to him, the applicant must have consumed 2354 units during the period of the energy bill in question and as such energy bill amounting to Rs. 12962/-came to be rightly issued. He added that after receipt of the applicant's complaint in May, 2006, the applicant's old meter was replaced by a new meter and her old meter was sent to the testing Unit for testing purposes. He reiterated the point that the meter test report was Ok.

He vehemently argued that the applicant cannot ask for relief against the disputed energy bill in question on the ground that her consumption previous to May, 2006 was comparatively much less. She also cannot claim such a relief on the ground that her new meter was showing comparative very less consumption as compared to the allegedly excessive consumption recorded in May,2005 by the old meter.

He lastly prayed that the grievance application may be rejected.

During the course of hearing on 27.10.2006, the applicant's representative contended that no load test was carried out in the testing Unit of Congressnagar Division. It was, therefore, decided to get the applicant's meter tested afresh on 30.10.2006 for load test in the resting laboratory in the premises of the Chief Engineer NUZ, Nagpur. It was also decided to carry out a detailed load test in the presence of the applicant's representative and also the representative of the

non-applicant. The Member-Secretary of this Forum was also asked to remain present at the time of the load test. Accordingly, the applicant's meter was tested afresh for its accuracy & load test on 30.10.2006 in the presence of the applicant's representative. The Dy. Executive Engineer, Testing Division, NUZ, Nagpur carried out the detailed load test and submitted his detailed report on 30.10.2006. A copy of this report was also given to the applicant's representative. This report is also duly signed by the applicant's representative without adding any comments whatsoever. This report clearly states that the meter error are found to be within permissible limits for accuracy and load test.

The meter in question was also shown to us on 30.10.2006 after the load test. All the seals of this meter were found to be intact.

After the load test, the applicant's representative was also given opportunity to put forth his say on this test report. He admitted that the load test was carried out in his presence and that he was satisfied with the entire procedure adopted while testing the applicant's meter. He has nothing adverse to say about the contents of the test report. However, he stated that the behavior of the applicant's meter was erratic in May,2006.

In the instant case, we are fully convinced that the applicant's old meter had worked properly and that there was no fault in it and also that the energy bills issued to the applicant were all correct. The applicant's representative's contention that the applicant's meter had shown erratic behavior cannot therefore sustain for want of any corroborating and cogent evidence.

In the result, we find that there is no substance in the present grievance application.

The same, therefore, stands rejected.

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