

## CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM M.S.E.D.C.L., PUNE ZONE, PUNE

Case No.01/2018

Date of Grievance : 01.01.2018 Date of Order : 01.03.2018

In the matter of change of the name.

Shri. Sandeep Bhaskarrao Joshi, Row House No.3, Suvidha House, S.No.87, Baner, Pune – 411045. **Complainant** (Herein after referred to as Consumer)

## Versus

The Executive Engineer, M.S.E.D.C.L., Shivajinagar Division, Pune. **Respondent** (Herein after referred to as Licensee)

<u>Quorum</u> Chairperson Member Secretary Member

<u>Appearance</u> For Consumer For Respondent Mr. B.D.Gaikwad Smt.B.S.Savant Mr. S.K.Jadhav

Mr.Kishor Dhotre, (Representative) Mr.V.Pawar, AEE, Aundh S/dn. Mrs.H.S.Thakur, Asstt.Acctt. Aundh S/dn.

- The Complainant above named has filed present Grievance application under regulation no. 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006.
- 2) Being aggrieved and dissatisfied by the order dated 6th Dec.2017 passed by IGRC Ganeshkhind Urban Circle, Pune, thereby rejecting the

01/2018

grievance, the consumer above named prefers present grievance application on the following amongst other grounds.

- 3) The papers containing the above grievance were sent by the Forum to the Executive Engineer, M.S.E.D.C.L., Shivajinagar Division vide letter no.EE/CGRF/PZ/Notice/01 of 2018/07 dtd. 04.01.2018. Accordingly the Distribution Licensee i.e. LICENSEE filed its reply on 03.02.2018.
- 4) We heard both sides at length and gone through the contentions of the consumer and reply of the respondent and the documents placed on record by the parties.

Facts giving rise to the grievance are stated as under :

- i) The consumer namely Mr. Sandeep Joshi having Consumer No.160220486025 is connected on 25.09.2012 in the tariff category LT-1 (Res) three phase and previously it was in another name during 2012. The Index – II of the house was in the name of Mr.Sandeep Joshi & his wife Mrs.Anuradha Joshi and it was registered on 20.2.2015.
- ii) The consumer applied for change of name on 04.09.2017.
- iii) The consumer paid amount of Rs.118/- on 1.2.2018 towards processing fee for change of name.
- iv) The consumer approached to IGRC with complaint dated 06.11.2017 that the change of name is not effected within stipulated time period and therefore SOP Compensation should be given to him and change of name be effected immediately.
- v) IGRC directed the licensee that the change of name shall be made as per LICENSEE's Rules & in case consumer fails to submit required documents, same to be informed to the consumer immediately and also informed that E.E. Shivajinagar to conduct an enquiry in this matter and take action as applicable vide impugned order dated 06.12.2017.
- vi) The licensee effected change of name of the consumer in the month of Nov. 2017.

- 5) The consumer representative Mr. Kishor Dhotre submitted that the change of name application was submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> Sept.2017 at Aundh Sub/dn. alongwith documents but he did not get any response from LICENSEE upto 27.9.2017 after follow up continuously with concerned Officers/Staff. Hence Shri. Dhotre has again filed the complaint on 27.9.2017 to the higher Authority i.e. Shivajinagar Dn. regarding change of name was not yet effected. Thereafter he had been lodged the complaint at IGRC, GKUC on 6.11.2017 and IGRC, GKUC has given the decision order on dtd.6.12.2017. In the decision order, it was mentioned that, the change of name shall be effected as per the MSEDCL's Rules and if the consumer fails to submit the required documents, then it will be informed to the consumer immediately. Also it was instructed that E.E. Shivajinagar Dn. has to conduct the enquiry in this matter and necessary action shall be taken if necessary.
- 6) Shri.Dhotre has complained that the LICENSEE employee has not followed the prescribed procedure intentionally even though all the relevant documents were already submitted to the office. Hence he has requested that the SOP shall be applicable from 4th Sept.2017 to till date as the change of name was not yet effected on the energy bill and the SOP shall be recovered from the erring employee of LICENSEE. He has demanded the SOP amount of Rs.2400/- for 24 weeks. Thereafter he submitted that the employees of the LICENSEE of sub/dn.s had visited the consumer's residence without knowledge of Shri. Sandeep Joshi. He stated that the prior intimation shall be given to the consumer and without any knowledge of consumer the MSEDCL employee shall not visit to the house of consumer. The staff has demanded amount of Rs.118/- as ransom and hence he has filed the police complaint at Aundh Police Station for the said matter as per the instructions of SE, GKUC, Pune & the said FIR has lodged on 17.2.2018. The employees of the Licensee have stated that this amount has been taken against the security

01/2018

deposit but the original receipt was not handed over to the consumer. Hence it cannot be said that there was demand of ransom of Rs.118/-.

- 7) It is submitted on behalf of the consumer that the SOP is applicable to the consumer amounting to Rs.2400/- from 4.9.2017 upto the change of name effected and this amount shall be recovered from the erring employee only and the necessary enquiry shall be made against them.
- 8) On the other hand Mr. Vishnu Pawar, AEE, Aundh S/dn. submitted that Shri.Dhotre has submitted the application on 4.9.2017 at Aundh Sub/dn. alongwith relevant documents but he did not submit the consent letter of consumer's wife Mrs.Anuradha Joshi. During the scrutiny, it is seen that the application is in the name of Mr.Sandeep Joshi whereas the Index-II of the property is in the name of Mr.Sandeep Joshi and his wife Mrs. Anuradha Joshi and the consent was not submitted by Mrs.Anuradha Joshi. In future, to avoid the legal complications the billing department has informed Mr.Dhotre on phone/verbally to submit the consent letter but there was no any response from the Mr.Dhotre. Mr. Sandeep Joshi has not submitted the authorization letter to Mr. Dhotre in case of MSEDCL's correspondence i.e. change of name. In the application merely telephone number was mentioned and on the said telephone number it was informed that the consent letter of Mrs.Anuradha Joshi shall be submitted. The complaint was made to the higher authority i.e. Division office Shivajinagar that the change of name was not effected by the Sub-dn. Hence sub/dn. has issued the letter to the consumer on dated 6.10.2017 for submission of consent of Mrs. Anuradha Joshi. The consumer has paid Rs.118/- against change of name vide receipt No. 0242912 dtd. 01.02.2018. The said amount was collecting by the staff of LICENSEE from Mrs. Anuradha Joshi. After payment all the procedure was followed as per MSEDCL's Rules & Regulations & there is no any delay regarding this matter & change of name was effected on monthly energy bill in the month of Nov.2017 immediately & hence SOP is not applicable. Mr.Dhotre has submitted that, the authorization letter has

01/2018

been given on behalf of Mr.Sandip Joshi but actually he has not submitted the same and only phone number was mentioned & the same phone number is in the name of Mr.Dhotre and not Mr. Sandeep Joshi. The LICENSEE representative has visited to Mr.Sandeep Joshi's residence & Mrs. Anuradha Joshi has submitted written statement on 1.2.2018 that there is no any complaint regarding the change of name as the same was effected on the energy bill and only the row house no. shall be changed from 4 to 3 on the energy bill in the address. This correction was already in process and it will be effected in the next monthly energy bill and hence there is no any grievance at this stage. It was also noted that the consumer/contractor has submitted the documents at sub-dn. level whereas the consent letter was submitted to Division Office instead of Sub-Dn. even though the contractor knows the LICENSEE's procedures and he has blamed employees for so called delay and it is not just and proper. It is submitted on behalf of Licensee that the employees can very well visit the house of the consumer if there is any complaint or for inspection and there is nothing wrong to visit the house of consumer. However the representative of consumer unnecessarily blaming employees of MSEDCL's and lodging false and frivolous complaint in the Police Station.

- 9) It is to be noted that the change of name in respect of consumer namely Shri. Sandeep Joshi & Mrs. Anuradha Joshi was effected on the energy bill in the month of Nov.2017 as per the procedure, Rules and Regulations of Licensee. There is no any delay occurred and also the consumer has given the written letter on dated 01.02.2018 that there is no grievance of change of name and there is no any complaint.

5

4.13 The Distribution Licensee shall intimate the charges to be borne by an applicant for change of name and change of tariff category within seven (7) days of receipt of an application in this regard and shall give effect to it within the following time limits:-

a) Change of name shall be effected within the second billing cycle on receipt of an application and payment of necessary charges.

11) Thus the change of name was effected in the month of Nov.2017 and accordingly the bills are issued to the consumer. The consumer did not raise any grievance regarding change of name after resolving the issue. The record clearly indicates that, the change of name was effected immediately i.e. in the next billing cycle. We therefore passed following order.

## <u>ORDER</u>

- 1. The Grievance is hereby dismissed.
- 2. No order as to cost.

Sd/-

Sd/-

Sd/-

<b>B.S.Savant</b>	S.K.Jadhav	B.D. Gaikwad
Secretary	Member	Chairperson
CGRF:PZ:PUNE	CGRF:PZ:PUNE	CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Note: - The consumer if not satisfied may file representation against this order before the Hon.' ble Ombudsman within 60 days from the date of this order at the following address.

Office of the Ombudsman, Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission, 606/608, Keshav Bldg. Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (E), Mumbai-51.