

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/077/2010

Applicant : Shri Z.S. Joshi
Through his son Shri Rajesh Joshi
At 176, Jawaharnagar,
Manewada Road,
NAGPUR.

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

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Shivajirao S. Patil
Chairman,

2) Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,
Member,

3) Smt. Kavita K. Gharat
Executive Engineer &
Member Secretary,

ORDER (Passed on 16.12.2010)

This grievance application is filed by Shri Zamashankar Joshi through his son Rajesh Joshi r/o 176, Jawaharnagar, Manewada Road, Nagpur on dated 21.10.2010 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.

1. According to the applicant, his consumer no. is 410011522622 for residential purpose. In the month of February 2010, he received a bill of Rs. 41,716.49. His old meter was changed in the month of January 2010. However in the bill of February 2010 consumption is surprisingly shown as 4905 units. Therefore the bill for the month of February 2010 amounting to Rs.41716.49 is excessive, exorbitant and unreasonable. Therefore the applicant has protested the bill for the month of February 2010 and requested for bill revision, to the non-applicant vide letter dated 26.03.2010. The applicant has not received any response from the non-applicant, hence filed the grievance application in IGRC on dated 01.04.2010. As no action was initiated by IGRC, being aggrieved the applicant has filed this grievance to the Forum on dated 21.10.2010. Thereby he requested to the Forum issuing proper bill of the actual energy consumed by him or at the most average bill.

2. The non-applicant submitted its reply on dated 18.11.2010. In this parawise reply, the non-applicant submitted that there was an old meter of the applicant. During the period July 2009 to December 2009 average bills of 165 units monthly were issued to the applicant. Thereafter in the month of January, 2010 wrong meter reading was taken on 17.01.2010 old meter no. 2044105 was changed. The reading of old meter at the time of replacement was 8905. On that place new

meter with no. 12672448 was installed, with initial reading as 000003. In the bill of January 2010 amount of average bill i.e. Rs.3704.99 was deducted and in the month of January-2010 with wrong meter reading a bill of Rs.1527.25 was issued.

3. The non-applicant further submitted in the same reply that there was wrong meter reading in the month of January 2010. The meter reading was reached to 4000 upto the month of January 2010. In other wards in several months only 500 units were billed to the consumer. Therefore in the month of February 2010, 4905 units of old meter and 142 units of new meter totally 5047 unit bill amounting to Rs.40189.24 was issued to the applicant. The applicant had complaint regarding this bill and therefore bill was divided for the tenure July 2009 to February 2010 in 8 months and slab benefit of Rs. 6843.81 was deducted and the same is reflected in the bill of March 2010. Therefore the consumer has to pay Rs.35249.35 as the bill issued to the applicant is a correct bill.
4. The matter was heard in the Forum on dated 19.11.2010. Both the parties were present. On behalf of non-applicant Shri S.P. Waghmare, Executive Engineer, Mahal Division was present. The applicant's side was presented by Shri. Rajesh Joshi.

5. Forum heard arguments from both the sides and persuade the entire record. During the course of hearing it was suggested by both the parties to examine and check the old meter of the applicant. But according to the non-applicant that old meter is even not traceable and it is not available even in the store. The non-applicant produced a copy of the letter outward no. 2713 dated 03.11.2010 addressed to the applicant. In this copy of letter, non-applicant had specifically mentioned that old meter of the applicant was replaced and was deposited in the store however at present old meter is not available for testing.

6. Forum had persuade photocopy of old meter it is completely imperceptible. It is really surprise, how and why old meter laying in the store of the non-applicant is not traceable. In fact it shows negligence of concerned staff of the non-applicant. It is pertinent to note that in the reply of the non-applicant dated 18.11.2010 it is specifically mentioned and admitted that in the month of January 2010 wrong meter reading was taken. This admission in writing given by the applicant is enough to come to conclusion that it is amounting to negligence on the part of the agency who took wrong meter reading in the month of January 2010. Therefore it is clear that it is nothing but un necessary harassment to the applicant.

7. During the course of arguments, the applicant aggrieved and informed to the Forum that when he requested to the non-

applicant to test that old meter lying in the store of MSEDCL, concerned staff of MSEDCL told to the applicant that there is big heap of the meters lying in the store room and applicant should personally searched his old meter. The applicant personally took un-necessary labour and manually search his meter in the entire store. Nobody of office of the non-applicant helped him or cooperated with him in searching old meter for testing. Even both the hands of the applicant were injured while searching the old meter. In the opinion of the Forum it is un-human treatment given by concerned officer of the non-applicant to the applicant. It is reasonable expectation of the Forum that in future, non-applicant shall not give such type of harassment to any of the consumer and required etiquette in the attitude of the non-applicant while dealing with its consumer. Needless to say that the Forum is to protect the rights of the consumer from such type of harassment within the provision of the said Regulations.

8. In the context of the meter reading in the month of January 2010, the Forum is of the view that the non-applicant is not able to trace the meter and not produced any proof for meter reading 8905. Also the non-applicant itself has accepted that meter reader has taken wrong reading in the part. Therefore Forum has not find any base for considering 8905 as the final reading of the old meter. Also the applicant's consumption trend as seen on CPL does not match with the non-applicant's assessment.

