

**Before Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Co. Limited
Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, Pune Zone,
925, Kasabapeth Building, IInd flr. Pune-11**

Case No.07/2013

Date: 21/08/2013

**In the matter of
Mr. R.V. Renuse
Shaniwarpeth Pune**

- Complainant

V/S

M.S.E.D.C.L.Shivajinagar Division

- Opponent

Quorum

Chair Person	Shri.S.D.Madake
Member/Secretary,	Shri.N.S.Prasad
Member	Shri.Suryakant Pathak

- 1) Ramesh Vaman Renuse is consumer of MSEDCL vide Con.No.160220078717 having taken electricity supply since 11/02/2003. According to complainant the MSEDCL has issued bills on the basis of inaccessible status during the period between Nov-2010 to March-2012. According to him the bills are issued in violation of the directions issued by MERC in case No.2 of 2003 pertaining to tariff order for 2003. It is further contended that the bills are issued in violation of MERC directives and the circulars issued by MSEDCL from time to time.
- 2) According to complainant as per the provisions of Part 15.4.1 of MERC regulations consumer is liable to pay the electricity bill for a period of three months only.

- 3) According to consumer, that MSEDCL requested him for checking of the meter but test lab at Baner was not as per the standard, laid down by electricity authority.
- 4) MSEDCL filed say and denied the allegations made in the complaint. The matter was taken before IGRC on the basis of contentions raised in the complaint. The IGRC discussed the various allegations in the light of legal position and rejected the prayer of complaint.
- 5) We have given anxious consideration to the submission made by both sides in the light of documents produced on record.
- 6) Admittedly the MSEDCL issued bills on the basis of inaccessible status during Nov-2010 to March-2012. MSEDCL admitted the mistakes committed by meter reading agency for long time and also lack of supervision by MSEDCL on the reading agency.
- 7) MSEDCL contended that, appropriate action as per rules is being taken against erring staff.
- 8) Consumer submitted that the MSEDCL is entitled to take bill for only three months. There is no evidence to prove that bills are based on defective meter. So prayer is not legal.
- 9) It is pertinent to note that, in pursuance of the order of IGRC the meter was to be tested in presence of consumer. The record shows that, MSEDCL sent letter to complainant for remaining

present for checking of meter. The submission of consumer that laboratory at Baner is not appropriate is not convincing.

- 10) The consumer if required is entitle to apply for checking of meter and MSEDCL has agreed for that at any time. At this stage it is clear that complainant failed to prove that bills are issued on defective meter.
- 11) MSEDCL has issued proper bills by waiving of the interest and giving slab benefits
- 12) Both parties agreed to settle the issue by amicable means. Accordingly complainant filed application for withdrawal of the complaint. He admitted the bill issued to be proper. He requested that he be permitted to pay arrears of the bill by five installments. MSEDCL agreed for the same and accordingly Deputy Executive Engineer made endorsement that contents are accepted.
- 13) In the result we pass following order in the interest of justice. .

ORDER

- 1) MSEDCL is directed to accept the arrears of Electricity bill of complainant by five equal monthly installments.
- 2) No order as to cost.

N.S.Prasad
Member/Secretary

Suryakant Pathak
Member

S.D.Madake
Chair Person

Date: 21/08/2013

