

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/287/2014

Applicant : Mrs. Amrit Singh,
201, Ishaan Apartments,
Clerk Town,
Nagpur.

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 5.1.2015.

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 11.11.2014 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

2. The applicant's case in brief is that she has made complaint to SNDL on 27.8.2012 regarding her excessive bill and also paid meter testing fees on 27.9.2012. There upon her meter was replaced and

tested in meter testing laboratory on 2.1.2013 and declared O.K. But applicant denied this report and insisted upon testing of her meter in her presence but her request was not considered nor her disputed bill revised.

3. Applicant then submitted second complaint on 13.11.2013 of fast running her new meter installed in the month of January 2013. Accordingly her new meter came to be tested in meter testing laboratory on 8.3.2014 in her presence and declared faulty but bill was not revised. Therefore applicant approached to I.G.R.C. on 9.9.2014 with request for revision of her bill as per her first complaint Dt. 27.8.2012 regarding disputed meter (Sr. No. 74/40829430) and as per her second complaint made on 13.11.2013 regarding her second disputed meter (Sr. No. 55/SND-00019). Learned I.G.R.C. decided the matter as per order dated 10.10.2014. Being aggrieved by the said order, applicant approached to this Forum.

4. Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 24.11.2014. It is submitted that on 25.8.2014 applicant complained about fastness of the meter and deposited meter testing charges on 27.9.2014. Meter of the applicant bearing No. 40829430 is replaced and new meter No. 55/SND00019 is installed. Previous meter No. 40829430 is tested in the laboratory and it is found O.K.

5. Again on 13.11.2013 applicant complained that newly installed meter No. 55/SND00019 is running fast. The said new meter is tested in meter testing laboratory and it is found faulty. Applicant approached to I.G.R.C. Learned I.G.R.C. passed order dated 10.10.2014 and directed to give relief to the applicant as discussed in the order. Therefore credit of Rs. 44464.64 is given to the applicant in

the bill of October 2014. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed.

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

7. It is noteworthy that as per first complaint of the applicant Dt. 27.8.2012, her disputed meter was tested on 2.1.2013 and declared O.K. But since meter testing in meter testing lab was not done in her presence, which was necessary from the point of view of principles of natural justice, report of meter testing lab can not be considered as valid. As such her disputed bills will have to be revised on the basis of her assessed consumption per month as per her connected load. Now her monthly assessed consumption as per her connected load of 7.00 kW should be $(7/2 \times 15 \times 30) = 1575$ units for the month of March to September being the hot season and $(4/2 \times 12 \times 30) = 720$ units during the month of October to February being winter season. Therefore as per her first complaint on 27.8.2012 her bill for July 2012 is required to be revised considering her assessed average consumption i.e. July 2012 of 1575 units. It is pertinent to note that there is no need to revise dispute bill of applicant prior to July 2012 since quantum of her actual consumption for the period prior to July 2012 is less than her assessed average consumption per month of 1575 units based on her actual load. Similarly her bills from October 2012 and November 2012 need to be revised considering her monthly average consumption of 720 units.

8. Secondly as regards her second complaint Dt. 13.11.2013 of her new meter her bill of October 2013 and November 2013 only are required to be revised considering her monthly average consumption of

720 units since quantum of consumption of these 2 bills is more than her assessed consumption of 720 units per month.

9. We have carefully perused order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. It is noteworthy that Learned I.G.R.C. passed well reasoned legal order and directed Commercial Manager 1) To revise the applicant's bill of July 2012 considering her monthly average consumption 1575 units and give credit to her $(2131-1575) = 556$ units, 2) To revise the applicant's bill of October 2012 & November 2012 considering her monthly average consumption of 720 units, thus giving credit to her of $(1090 - 720) = 370$ units and $(1173-720)=453$ units respectively for these 2 months, 3) Thus quantum of total credit to be given to the applicant as per her first complaint of 27.8.2012 regarding meter No. 74/40829430 shall be $556 + 370 + 453 = 1379$ units, 4) To revise applicant's bill of October 2013 & November 2013 considering her monthly consumption of 720 units and give credit to her $(1656 - 720) = 936$ units and $(1227 - 720) = 507$ units. Thus making the total of $(936 + 507) = 1443$ units as per her second complaint on 13.11.2013 regarding meter No. 55/SND00019 declared faulty.

10. Therefore considering the entire record, both the complaints of the applicant, the total credit of $(1379 + 1443) = 2822$ units should be given to her along with credit on account of arrears of interest of Rs. $(7873+1350) =$ Rs. 9223 in her ensuing bill.

11. Learned I.G.R.C. had already given this much relief to the applicant after proper calculations. In reply of SNDL Dt. 24.11.2014, in last para SNDL submitted that as per order of Learned I.G.R.C. bills are revised and credit of Rs. 44464.64 is given to the applicant and deducted this amount in the bill of October 2014. Therefore order of

Learned I.G.R.C. is already complied. In our considered opinion, it is the only relief which can be granted to the applicant. It is noteworthy that in order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. Commercial Manager was directed to submit compliance report to I.G.R.C. by 20.10.2014. Order is complied in October 2014 itself. Therefore there is prompt compliance by SNDL.

12. Order passed by Learned I.G.R.C. is legal and proper and 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