Applicant :	Smt. Sumati Tarkunde, 29, Shivaji Nagar, Dharampeth Extn., Nagpur-440010.
Non-applicant :	Nodal Officer, The Executive Engineer, CongressNagar Dn., M.S.E.D.C.L., Nagpur.
Applicant represented by : Non-applicant represented	Shri M. R. Tarkunde. by: 1) Shri P. A. Gunale, Addl.Exe.Engr., 2) Shri M.S. Ghanote, Dy.Manager.
Quorum Present	<ul> <li>1) Shri Arvind Jayram Rohee, Chairperson.</li> <li>2) Mrs. V.N.Parihar, Member Secretary</li> <li>3) Mrs. Asmita Avinash Prabhune, Member(CPO)</li> </ul>

## Case No. CGRF(NZ)/09/2019

## ORDER PASSED ON 24.04.2019

 The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 28.01.2019 under clause 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 21.02.2019 & 22.04.2019.

3) On behalf of applicant Shri Manohar R. Tarkunde presented her grievance, feeling aggrieved by the IGRC, NUC order passed on 16.01.2019 in Case No.16/2018. On 28.01.2019 both the parties were present.

4) Applicant's Representatives Shri Manohar R. Tarkunde & Shri V.R. Motghare & on behalf of Respondent Shri Gulhane, Addl.Ex.Engr. Shankar Nagar Sub-Division & Shri M.S. Ghanote Dy.Manager (F&A) Congress Nagar Division MSEDCL, Nagpur were heard on merit of the case.

5) During the arguments the applicant reiterated the facts stated in application. Non applicant also stated facts as per the pleading.

6) The applicant with consumer No. 410010781144 (Since 1972) submitted his grievance application stating that in Sept.2018, applicant received exorbitant bill of Rs.48610/-. Prior to that Applicant made complaint to MSEDCL, NUC. on 30.07.18 regarding low consumption as shown in bill, Applicant suspected some error in his August 2018 energy bill/meter. Hence he lodged complaint on 03.08.2018. The meter appeared to have developed some flaw, hence on his request MSEDCL changed the meter having meter No. 053-15363485. 7) The first bill of August.2018 issued in Sept.2018 was for Rs.48612.63 and hence said meter is replaced on 04.08.2018. For this excessive bill MSEDCL submitted that it was a cumulative bill for part 2-3 months included & applicant had paid the bill. Once again in Oct.2018 energy bill issued was of Rs.45496.33. Applicant complained to MSEDCL & they agreed that the meter was faulty, since No load meter was continued to run. Hence once again said meter was replaced on 01.11.2018 with New meter No. 6503420566. Old meter 05315363485 was tested on 06.11.2018 in testing unit & found OK. The final reading was 13958 Units.

8) As per the non applicant's submission, in the month of Nov.2018, MSEDCL issued average bill for 2193 units, but in the month of Dec.2018 bill for two months was issued as per meter reading & credit of Rs.32348.68 was given in Dec.2018 for average bill issued in Nov.2018. Average bill & arrears bill of Oct.2018 total amounting to Rs.78980/- was issued in Nov.2018. Out of it the applicant made payment of Rs.46000/- on 17.11.2018 & Rs.6800/- on 25.01.2019 leaving balance of Rs.78980 – (46000 + 6800) = 26,180/-.

9) As per the applicants request meter No. 05315363485 was again tested in the Testing Dn. Nagpur on 11.01.2019 in the presence of applicant & it was found OK, since meter error was within permissible limits.

Forum is of the view that disputed meter is tested twice 10) in both the meter Testing Laboratory & found OK. During hearing applicant submitted increase of 183 units consumption in the meter during its testing which was noted even after it was replaced and hence it is faulty and not OK. Accordingly this forum directed non applicant to submit necessary clarification so as to remove doubt of the applicant that meter is running even on no load and after it is taken away for testing. Non applicant filed on record clarificatory letter dated 24.04.2019 stating that said meter no. 5315363485 was installed at Pri Trivedi Mewad Brahman Samaj having consumer no. 410012271003 due to shortage of meters. It is also submitted that consumption of 183 units is recorded for them. It was working properly as there was no complaint regarding this recording done by the disputed meter. Therefore, it can safely be said that the meter was not running at no load as doubted by the applicant.

11) Since meter's accuracy is within permissible limits & whatever energy bills are issued are as per actual consumption recorded by the meter only, applicant must have used facility of electricity and hence he is responsible for said consumption. As such applicant's claim for revision of energy bills cannot be considered. The order of IGRC are rejecting claim is justified & needs no interference.

12) Apart from this there may be some defect in earthling and or internal wiring which resulted in recording of higher consumption, although no defect is noticed in the meter on testing. It is contented by the applicant that after meter is replaced there, is no problem regarding consumption. As such it can be concluded that the said fault might have been corrected during subsequent meter replacement. As the electricity consumption utilized by the applicant is correctly recorded by the meter, energy bills issued for disputed meter is in order and therefore needs no revision. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence the following order.

## <u>ORDER</u>

1) Grievance applicant is hereby dismissed.

2) No order as to costs.

Sd/- Sd/-(Mrs. Asmita A. Prabhune) (Mrs. V.N.Parihar) MEMBER(CPO) MEMBER SECRETARY Sd/-(Arvind J. Rohee) CHAIRPERSON

Page 5 of 5

Case No.09/2019