

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

Case No. CGRF(NUZ)/79/2012

Applicant : Shri Vinod Ruplal Vyas,
At Nai Basti, Sweeper Colony,
NAGPUR.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,
The Superintending Engineer,
(Distribution Franchisee),
M.S.E.D.C.L. NAGPUR.

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

2) Adv. Smt. Gouri Chandrayan,
Member,

3) Smt. Kavita K. Gharat
Member Secretary.

ORDER PASSED ON 17.9.2012.

The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 21.7.2012 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as Regulations).

1. The applicant's case in brief is that there is problem in electricity bill for the month of January 2010. The applicant applied

for revision of his bill on 12.10.2011 but up till now bill of January 2010 is not revised. Therefore requested to revise this bill and claim compensation of Rs. 5000/-.

2. M/s. SPANCO franchisee of distribution licensee denied applicant's case by filing reply Dt. 17.8.2012. It is submitted that bills as per meter reading are issued to the applicant. Account books of the applicant (CPL) shows that till May 2009 bills are issued as per actual meter reading. In June 2009 meter reading was 12211. In May 2011 also the meter reading was same. During the period of June 2009 to May 2011, average bill of 76 units per month were given to the applicant. Initial reading was shows '1' & average bill of 100 units was issued. In July 2011 meter reading was shows as 11352 and bill of 26 months of 11351 units was issued. Out of which amount of Rs. 6496.79 of average bill was deducted and bill for 65480.14 was issued. Since then applicant stopped making the payment. Thereafter the applicant paid Rs. 1000/- on 25.11.2011, Rs. 5000/- on 22.2.2012. Since then till July 2012 the applicant did not pay any amount. Amount of Rs. 87330/- is due and outstanding against the applicant.

3. It is further submitted that after installation of new meter on the site of the applicant consumption of the applicant per month was as under :-

1)	August 2011	-	386 units
2)	September 2011	-	278 units
3)	October 2011	-	466 units
4)	November 2011	-	239 units
5)	December 2011	-	544 units
6)	January 2012	-	250 units

7)	February 2012	-	275 units
8)	March 2012	-	273 units
9)	April 2012	-	513 units
10)	May 2012	-	489 units
11)	June 2012	-	510 units
12)	July 2012	-	442 units

	Total	-	4665 units

Therefore consumption of the applicant was 381 units per month.

4. Reading of July 2011 was not available and therefore initial reading was taken as '1' and average bill of 26 months for 11351 units as per consumption pattern was issued and it is correct.

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

6. Applicant claimed revision of bill for January 2010. However, present grievance application is filed in this Forum on 21.7.2012 i.e. after a period of 2 years. According to regulation 6.6 of the said regulations, the Forum shall not admit any grievance unless it is filed within a period of 2 years from the date on which cause of action has arisen. According to the applicant bill of January 2010 is excessive and wrong. Therefore cause of action arose in January 2010 or at the most in February 2010 when the bill was actually issued. Therefore it is necessary for the applicant to file grievance application on or before February 2012. But present grievance application is filed on 21.7.2012 and hence it is barred by limitation according to regulation 6.6 of the said regulations.

7. There is nothing on record to show that meter is faulty. It is not the contention of the application anywhere in the application that the meter is faulty. According to non-applicant also meter is not faulty. Therefore there is no scope for revision of bill. In grievance application the applicant simply claimed revision of bill for January 2010. In our opinion, there is no necessity to revise the bill considering CPL and other evidences on record. For these reasons application deserves to be dismissed. Hence the Forum proceeds to pass the following order :-

ORDER

- 1) The Grievance application is dismissed.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
(Smt.K.K.Gharat)	(Adv.Smt.GauriChandrayan)	(ShriShivajirao S.Patil)
MEMBER	MEMBER	CHAIRMAN
SECRETARY		