

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

---

**Case No. CGRF(NZ)/56/2016**

Applicant : M/s Tanuj Dairy Tech Pvt. Ltd,  
609/610, Opp. UBI Ghat Road  
Nagpur-440018

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,  
The Superintending Engineer,  
(D/F.) NUC, MSEDCL,  
NAGPUR.

---

Applicant :- In person.

Respondent by 1) Shri Gotmare, EE, Nodal Office  
2) Shri Larokar, Nodal Office.  
3) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL Nagpur.

---

Quorum Present : 1) Mrs. V.N.Parihar,  
Member, Secretary  
& I/C.Chairman.  
  
2) Shri N.V.Bansod,  
Member

---

**ORDER PASSED ON 04.06.2016.**

1. The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 05.05.2016 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as said Regulations).
2. Non applicant, denied applicant's case by filing reply dated 16.05.2016.
3. Forum heard arguments of both the sides and perused record.

4. As per applicant, his grievance is about enhancement of his factory connected load, and subsequent replacement of the current transformer on date 31.03.2011 by the non-applicant. Thereafter wrongly charging of MF from 1 to 2 from the billing month of Jan-2011, which leads to non-applicant's proposed recovery from January-2011 to June-2011 amounting to Rs.729129=97 p.s which is raised in the billing month of October- 2011. The Applicant contented that non-applicant should have given effect of MF as 2 from April-2011 to June-2011 instead of January-2011 to June-2011,as actual CT replacement has been done in the month of April-2011, To substantiate his claim he has produced letters written by Jr.Engineer S.T.Stand D/c,MSEDCL having no. 256 dt. 13/04/15, stating, the date of replacement of existing C.T. having ratio 100/5 by C.T. having ratio 200/5 as 31/03/2011,due to which new Multiplying factor has been changed from 1 to 2 .In support of this fact, he produced Jr.Engineer S.T.Stand D/c,MSEDCL letters, having nos. 210,237 dt. 13-01-11and 03-03-11 respectively,whereby requirement of CT having ratio 200/5 was sent to the Executive Engineer Mahal Division. The applicant also brought this fact to SE,NUC,vide his letter dt. 08/10/2015,dt.10/03/15 MSDCL replied vide letter dt 5688 dt.28/10/2015 stating that on payment of Demand on dt. 12/01/11, due to change in CT ,MF is changed and hence their load is enhanced from Jan-11.but while actual billing MF was not changed. This mistake is rectified in the month of June2011 and hence their bills are revised accordingly. Applicant keeps requesting non-applicant about this grievance till 10-03-2015 with number of correspondence. Not satisfied with non-applicant's reply applicant filed his grievance with IGRC on dt.26-04-16.

2. The Non-applicant stated in their reply that as per application submitted in the month of Dec-2010, MSEDCL has enhanced their load to 200 HP in the m/o Jan-11. Energy Bills for the duration from Jan-11 to June11 has been wrongly charged considering MF as 1. Energy Bills from July-2011 has been charged considering MF as 2. Hence Bills for the duration from Jan-11 to June11 has been revised considering MF as 2 and revised bill of Rs.729129.97 has been issued which is in order.

3. IGRC observed on the basis of the documents submitted by applicant, it is clear that current transformer required for enhancement of load , was replaced on dated 31-03-2011 and applicable MF 2 is effective from April-2011 instead of January-2011. IGRC further observed that since the recovery is prepared by MSEDCL official their cell has no jurisdiction to give any directives to MSEDCL and cell cannot call MSEDCL for submission of relevant documents in support of their action for effecting recovery the for period of 6 months from January-2011 to June-2011. IGRC due to constraint of jurisdictional power was unable to decide the applicant's grievance.

3. Dissatisfied with the points raised by IGRC about procurement of relevant documents as well as their constraint of jurisdictional power, applicant approached the forum..

4. Forum perused the document which reveals that applicant applied for extension of load 200 HP on 21-12-2010 and applicant paid demand of Rs.108836/- on 12-01-2011.

On perusal of letter dated 03-03-2011 and 19-04-2011 filed by applicant, Junior Engineer requested to Executive Engineer as mentioned below,

*“CT requirement letter is already submitted as per ref. letter. But CT is not issued yet. Consumer is forcing for up- gradation of CT as he has to extend his load. But unable to do so because of low existing CT ratio. So you are requested to pl. issue the CT as early as possible”.*

and another letter clearly demonstrate that current transformer(C.T.) was replaced on dated 31-03-2011 and there is further correspondence by the applicant regarding incorrect application of MF 2 from January-2011 instead of 31-03-2011. However Non-applicant denied all the letters of JE submitted as documentary evidence, stating that those letters are never received by E.E. Mahal and hence should not be consider as a evidence for replacement of CT on dt.30-03-2016. But could not substantiate their contention any documentary evidence that, current transformer having ratio 200/5 for 200 HP load was installed or replaced in the m/o. January-2011. During the arguments again and again it was emphasized to non-applicant to submit the documents such as gate pass no. for issue of CT, Testing report, commissioning report etc.,.but Non-applicant failed to produce any documentary evidence to prove that that CT was replaced in the month of Jan-11 instead of March-2011.

5. In view of the above observation, applicant proved by documentary evidence, that replacement of current transformer is done on date 31-03-2011 and

From April-2011 billing month only, applicant is liable to charged for MF 2 and same thing is observed by IGRC also. Applicant pursued the grievance by sending number of letters but no cognizance was taken by the authority.

6. Considering all aforesaid facts, forum is of firm opinion that applicant's current transformer was replaced on date 31-03-2011 and applicant is liable to pay bills considering MF as 2 from the billing month of April-2011 only.

7. Hence this order.

#### ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is allowed.
- 2) The bill amount of Rs.729129=97 p.s for the period January-2011 to June-2011 is to be quashed and set aside and directed non-applicant to issue revised bill from 31-03-2011 to 30-06-2011 considering MF 2 without DPC and interest.
- 3) Non-applicant is directed to adjust the amount if any he has deposited from the revise bill. And grant 3 equal installments for recovery as per MF 2 from April-2011 to June-2011.
- 4) Compliance report to be submitted to this office within 30 days from date of this order.
- 5) No order as to cost.

Sd/-  
(N.V.Bansod)  
MEMBER

sd/-  
(Mrs.V.N.Parihar),  
MEMBER/SECRETARY  
& I/C. CHAIRMAN

