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

Case No. CGRF(NZ)/69/2018

Applicant : Shri Bhojraj Gendalal Patle,

Navkanya Nagar, Bharatwada Road, Nagpur – 440008.

Non-applicant: Nodal Officer,

The Superintending Engineer

(D/F), NUC, MSEDCL,

Nagpur.

Applicant represented by : In person.

Non-applicant represented by:1) Shri S.R.Sonkusle, Exe.Engr,

2) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL, Nagpur

Quorum Present

: 1) Shri Arvind Jayram Rohee,

Chairperson.

Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member Secretary

3) Mrs. Asmita Avinash Prabhune Member (CPO)

ORDER PASSED ON 06.09.2018

- 1) The applicant presented this grievance application before this Forum on 02.06.2018 under Regulation 6.4 of the MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006.
- 2) Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dt. 29.06.2018.
- 3) Forum heard arguments of both the parties on 03.07.2018, 10.07.2018, 31.07.2018, 31.08.2018 and carefully perused the entire case record.

Page 1 of 4 Case No 69 /2018

- 4) The applicant with no.40015332909 consumer submitted his grievance application stating that debit of Rs.23722/is raised in his bill of Mar-2018 towards old PD dues of consumer no.410015333573 in the name of the applicant and in the same premises. But, the applicant does not agree with this debit amount as according to him, he has taken only one connection with consumer no.410015332909 and not the other one, ie. connection with consumer no. 410015333573. Hence, he has requested to quash and withdraw debit amount of Rs.23722/-. He approached the IGRC for necessary relief but IGRC rejected the grievance application.
- 5) The Nodal officer of MSEDCL was asked to submit the spot verification report confirming that the PD connection was at the same premises where live connection of the applicant exists. He has confirmed the same and forwarded the image of the installation on 09.07.2018 of the existing live connection where old PD consumer no. 410015333573 is written on the main switch of live connection which shows that the PD connection was given in the same premises of the applicant.
- 6) This has been confirmed from the fact that the New Service Connection (NSC) documents of 2 connections namely 410015332909 (live) & 410015333573 (PD connection) with paid demand details are also filed on record by Non-applicant. They

Page 2 of 4 Case No 69 /2018

have filed two sets of NSC documents with 2 demand notes both in the name of the applicant. After verification of NSC documents filed by Non-applicant, it is seen that applicant sought one connection for residential purpose and other for commercial purpose (cycle repairing shop). Moreover, the applicant had paid both the demands for both the connections, i.e. one demand for residential connection was paid on 06.02.2013 and the connection was released on 06.02.2013. Second demand for commercial purpose was paid on 12.12.2013 and the connection was released on 12.12.2013. Being for distinct use, both the connections were given in the same premises. But, since the applicant did not pay the bill of consumer no. 410015333573, the connection was PD in Oct-2017 with dues of Rs.112897/-. But, these arrears were inclusive of fictitious arrears and after deducting fictitious arrears the net recoverable dues comes Rs.23722/-. The Non-applicant to transferred the PD dues being in the same premises, on existing live connection no. 4140015332909 of the applicant in the same premises.

7). As per documents filed on record, the PD dues in the name of the applicant belongs to the premises of live connection which is in the name of the applicant and hence the action of transfer of the PD dues on live connection in the same name is quite justified and legal as per the provisions of Section 56(1) of the Electricity Act, 2003. As such the applicant's request to withdraw the debit amount

Page 3 of 4 Case No 69 /2018

from his live connection cannot be considered. Therefore order of

IGRC is just and proper which needs no interference. The

applicant's grievance application, therefore, stands dismissed. No

order to cost

Sd/-

MEMBER(CPO)

Sd/-

Sd/-

(Mrs. Asmita A. Prabhune) (Mrs. V.N.Parihar) (Arvind J. Rohee)

Chairperson MEMBER SECRETARY

Nagpur

Dt.: 06.09.2018

Page 4 of 4 Case No.69/2018