

08/2018



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

Case No. 08/2018

Date of Grievance : 20.02.2018

Date of Order : 09.04.2018

In the matter of exorbitant billing.

The Chairman,  
Parvati Industrial Estate  
Co.Op.Socy.Ltd.,  
Pune Satara Road, Parvati,  
Pune - 411009

---

**Complainant**

**Versus**

The Executive Engineer,  
M.S.E.D.C.L.,  
Padmavati Division,  
Pune.

---

**Respondent**

(Herein after referred to as Licensee)

**Quorum**

Chairperson

Mr. B.D.Gaikwad

Member/Secretary

Mrs.B.S.Savant

Member

Mr. A.P.Joshi

**Appearance**

For Consumer

Mr.Kishor Dhotre (Representative)

For Respondent

Mr.R.S.Yedake,Addl. Ex.Engineer,

Marketyard Sub/Division

Mrs.Savita A.Wani, UDC,Marketyard S/dn.

- 1) The applicant has filed present Grievance application under regulation no. 6.4 of the MERC (CGRF and Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006.

- 2) The consumer grievance is submitted by the Chairman, Parvati Industrial Estate Co. Op. Socy. Ltd., Pune. It is the case of consumer that the single phase, Residential connection bearing No.170018340553, PC-1. It is submitted that the display of the electric meter was not properly working. The said meter was therefore replaced on 21.3.2017 and new electric meter bearing no.4817082 installed. When the new meter was installed, it showed reading of 2588 units. However meter change was not effected on energy bill and abnormal bill for the period 21.3.2017 to 03.10.2017 was given. The meter was again replaced on 03.10.2017 and new meter bearing no.40744571 was installed and said no. was appearing on the electric bills. It is also the case of consumer that from Sept.2017 to Dec.2017 the Respondent issued provisional bills. The correction of the electric bill was not carried. It is submitted that as the correction of the bills was not carried within stipulated period, the consumer is entitled for Standard of Performance (SOP) as per rules and amount of SOP may be recovered from the concerned employees of MSEDCL. It is also submitted that necessary action may be taken against the erring employees and fine may be imposed on him.
- 3) Initially the matter was heard by IGRC, Rastapeth Urban Circle, Pune. The IGRC concerned passed order dated 20.01.2018 and held that the bills issued are correct and as per Rules. It is also fact that the consumer is not entitled for SOP as the electric bill is corrected considering grievance of the consumer. The consumer being dissatisfied with the said decision has preferred present grievance before this Forum.
- 4) The representative of MSEDCL has submitted the say dated 27.03.2018 contending that the average consumption of the said consumer was between 200 to 225 units per month. In the month of May-2016 the electric meter was not working properly and the meter showed zero units for the period June-2016 to Nov.-2016. It is submitted that during the period of Dec.2016 to April-2017 average bill of 95 units per month was given to the consumer. It is admitted that on 21.03.2017 the meter was replaced and it was of Genus-Make, one bearing No.4817082 single phase, and the Initial reading was of 2588 KWH. It is submitted that in the month of May-2017 the reading of the

said meter was 2875 units but the replacement of the meter was not informed to sub-division and so in the month of May-2017 Final Reading (FR) of old meter was 848 units. The MSEDCL therefore issued differential bill of 2027 units as the reading of new meter was 2675. When the bill was being corrected it was noticed that the average consumption of the consumer was 200 units per month but the bill of Zero units was given to the consumer for the period June-2016 to Nov.2016. It is submitted that from Dec.2016 to April-2017 the average bill of 95 units per month was given to the consumer. It is further submitted that for the period June-2016 to May-2017 the average bill of 200 units per month for the period of 12 of 2400 units was to be paid by the consumer and it was expected from the consumer. It is submitted that the said fact was informed to representative of consumer namely Mr.Dhotre on 24.10.2017. The said representative agreed to pay the bills if the bill of 2027 units is divided into 11 months. It is submitted that the bill was accordingly revised on 24.6.2017 and there was Credit B-80 of Rs.14878.54 and it was accordingly given to the consumer.

- 5) It is admitted fact that the consumer has made payment of Rs.10,000/- on 25.9.2017. The bill revised is correct and it is as per Consumer Personal Ledger (CPL) and average monthly consumption of electricity by the consumer. It is submitted that the early electric meter of the consumer was of Rolex-make and it is known fact that the said meter were not working properly and presently the meter of Rolex- make are not installed by MSEDCL. It is submitted that present representative Mr.Dhotre is also the contractor of MSEDCL and he intentionally instigates the complaints. He used to mislead the consumers. It is submitted that even on 09.03.2018 all the information of bills was given to representative Mr.Dhotre and he was satisfied with the explanatory and so consumer has paid remaining bill of Rs.10,310/- on 10.03.2018 vide Receipt No.8874426. However even thereafter the consumer was misled. Lastly on 10.03.2018 consumer has given the letter stating that there is no any complaint in respect of bill issued by MSEDCL and grievance is completely resolved. Even on today (05.04.2018) the consumer has given the letter and informed that there is absolutely no

any complaint regarding the bills and the grievance submitted before this Forum may be disposed of is the remaining bill of Rs.10310/- is paid on 10.03.2018.

- 6) The hearing of the present grievance was conducted on 05.04.2018. We have heard both the side at length. We have also perused the documents submitted on record.
- 7) In fact there are 2 letters given by the consumer and those are placed on record. The letters dated 10.03.2018 and 05.04.2018 clearly indicates that there is no any grievance of the consumer as the grievance is completely resolved. The consumer has paid the amount of Rs.10,000/- on 25.09.2017 and amount of Rs.10310/- on 10.03.2018. The letter dated 05.04.2018 clearly indicate that the consumer is not willing proceed the grievance before this Forum as the grievance is already resolved and he prays for dispoal of present grievance. It may be noted that both the letters were brought to the notice of representative of consumer namely Mr.Dhotre. However he submitted that the letters are submitted during pendency of present grievance and consumer may be heard. We therefore heard the representative Mr.Dhotre.
- 8) According to Mr.Dhotre the letter dated 10.03.2018 given by the consumer was under duress and it was not submitted voluenterily by the consumer. We disagree with the said submission because the consumer is the Chairman, Parvati Industrial Estate Co. Op. Socy. Ltd., Pune. Moreover the said consumer has again submitted letter dated 5.4.2018 requesting to dispose off the present grievance as the grievance is resolved. Under this circumstances it can not be said that there was any compulsion or force in submitting both the letters.
- 9) The consumer representative Mr. Dhotre submitted that the bills for the period Sept.2017 to Dec.-2017 which is not corrected within stipulated period and he claims Standard of performance. It is also submitted that the bill for the period 21.3.2017 to 03.10.2017 is abnormal bill and it was not correct. We are unable to agree with him because Consumer Personal Ledger clearly indicates that for the period June-2016 to Nov.-2016 bill of zero units given to the consumer. The records also indicates that Dec..2016 to April-2017 average

bill of 95 units per month were given to the consumer. It is rightly submitted of behalf of MSEDCL for the average monthly consumption of said consumer was of 200 units. It is submitted that the slab benefit of Rs.15624/- was given in the month of June-2017 and it was effected in the month of July-2017. It is also rightly submitted for monthly average consumption is 200 to 225 units even before meter replacement and after meter replacement. Under these circumstances it cannot be said that the bills not corrected within prescribed period and consumer is entitled for Standard of Performance. We also concluded that consumer is not entitled the SOP amount and for the disciplinary action of employees of MSEDCL. We do not notice any fault in the SOP on the part of employees and so no action can be suggested against that. We therefore hold that the present grievance is devoid of merits and shall be dismissed. We therefore passed following order.

### **ORDER**

- a) **The grievance is dismissed**
- b) **No orders as to cost.**

**A.P.Joshi**  
Member  
CGRF:PZ: PUNE

**B.S.Savant**  
Member/Secretary  
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

**B.D.Gaikwad**  
Chairperson  
CGRF:PZ:PUNE

Note :- The consumer if not satisfied may filed 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.