

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/020/2015

Applicant : Shri Shriprasad S. Rangari,
147, Laghuvetan Colony,
Kamptee Road,
Nagpur : 14.

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 3.3.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 21.01.2015 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 he is receiving excessive bills. Being aggrieved by the order passed by I.G.R.C. he approached to this Forum.

3. SNDL denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 2.2.2015. It is submitted that meter was tested in meter testing laboratory of SNDL on 12.10.2013 and it is found O.K. Therefore bills issued to applicant are correct and can not be revised. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

5. Record shows that there are two CPL in this matter. One connection is in the name of the applicant Shriprasad S. Rangari and another in the name of his father Shri Sitaram M. Rangari. Applicant argued before the Forum that since May 2013, his father is residing with him on the ground floor and previously father was residing with brother on first floor. We have carefully perused CPL of the applicant Consumer No. 410016937812. This CPL shows that consumption of the applicant was tremendously less in number of months i.e. in January 2012 – 0 units, February 2012 – 0 units, March 2012 – 1 unit, in April 2012 – 3 units, May 2012 – 5 units, June 2012 – 1 unit, July 2012 – 7 units, August 2012 – 8 units, September 2012 – 9 units, October 2012 – 5 units, November 2012 – 3 units, December 2012 – 1 unit, January 2013 – 1 unit, February 2013 – 0 unit, March 2013 – 1 unit, April 2013 – 4 units. It appears that in all these months, supply was diverted on another meter in the name of his father Shri Sitaram Rangari Consumer No. 410012065683 and that may be the reason why consumption of the applicant is just like '0' since January 2012 to May 2013. To fill up this lacuna, applicant is telling imaginary story that previously his father was residing with his brother on first floor and since May 2013 came to reside with him on ground floor. Under no stretch of imagination there can be such type of less consumption as shown in January 2012 to April 2013 for a period of 14 months. It is noteworthy that

again in the CPL of the applicant Shriprasad Consumer No. 410016937812, '0' consumption is shown since June 2014 to January 2015. Applicant argued that in November 2013, meter is replaced. When meter is changed in November 2013, there can not be '0' consumption since June 2014 to January 2015 in CPL of the applicant and connection is shown live during the period June 2014 to January 2015. When connection was live, it is impossible to have '0' consumption in these months.

6. It is the contention of the applicant that in September 2013, reading is 403, October 2013 – 367 units, and in November 2013 – 259 units. Therefore meter is jumped in these months. However, consumption trend in CPL of his father Shri Sitaram Consumer No. 410012065683 shows that in the month of June 2012, consumption was 310 units, in July 2012 – 474 units, August 2012 – 314 units, in September 2012 – 452 units, in October 2012 – 352 units, February 2013 – 323 units, in March 2013 – 394 units, in April 2013 – 590 units, in May 2013 – 335 units, in June 2013 – 559 units, in May 2014 – 361 units, in June 2014 – 583 units, in July 2014 – 499 units, in August 2014 – 345 units, in September 2014 – 371, in October 2014 – 418.

7. After careful perusal of both these CPL in one premises, one in the name of the applicant and another in the name of his father, it appears that they might have manipulated the meter by diverting entire supply in some month on one meter and later on alleged that in some months meter is jumped. In our considered opinion, it is designly defective activity committed by the applicant and meter is definitely not jumped. We have carefully perused spot inspection report of both the connections.

8. Meter is tested in the meter testing laboratory on 12.10.2013 and it is found O.K. Therefore bill can not be revised. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence the following order.

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Anil Shrivastava)
MEMBER
SECRETARY

Sd/-
(Adv. Subhash Jichkar)
MEMBER

Sd/-
(Shivajirao S. Patil),
CHAIRMAN