

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

Case No. CGRF(NZ)/126/2018

Applicant : Shri Mustaq Ahmad Abdul Nazir Ahmad,
Plot No. 5, New Colony,
Swagat Nagar Ring Road,
Nagpur.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,
The Superintending Engineer,
(D/F), NUC, M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Nagpur.

Applicant represented by : Shri Mustaq Ahmad A. Nazir Ahmad,
Non-applicant represented by: 1) Shri Sonkusle, E.E.
MSEDCL,
2) Shri Dahasahastra, SNDL, Nagpur

Quorum Present : 1) Shri Arvind Jayram Rohee,
Chairperson.
2) Mrs. V.N.Parihar,
Member Secretary
3) Mrs. Asmita Avinash Prabhune,
Member(CPO)

ORDER PASSED ON 25.04.2019

1) The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 05.12.2018 under Regulation 6.4 of the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission (Consumer Grievance Redressed Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations 2006 (2) Non applicant denied applicant's case by filing reply dt. 15.01.2019.

3) Forum heard arguments of both the parties & perused the case record.

4) The applicant with consumer No. 410017050218 in his grievance application stated that he forwarded intimation to commercial section of N.A. on 6.11.2017 regarding non use of his premises from 8.11.2017 & shall user the premises from 05.07.2018 & hence accordingly the bills should be issued. Again on 30.06.2018 he had given letter to replace the meter as the meter was faulty i.e. No Display Again on 03.07.2018 he issued a letter stating that he received average bills from Nov.2017 due to no display on the meter & requested to revise the average bills from Nov. 2017 to June 2018. The applicant however received average bills upto Sept. 2018 & faulty meter was replaced on 27.09.2018. Hence, he requested Forum for revising average bills from Nov.2017 to June 2018 and he is ready to pay the amount of bill for his actual consumption.

5) Non applicant in his reply dt. 12.01.2019 stated that applicant has given intimation on 6.11.2017 regarding non user of his premises from 8.11.2017 to 05.07.2018 Applicant has submitted the proof regarding his foreign visit i.e Air ticket copy. On 19.05.18 site inspection was carried out in which it is found that supply was in use. Applicant had not submitted any proof of returning, from abroad. Hence, the benefit of revision for non use of premises was given only for 4 months i.e. Nov.2017 to Feb.2018 considering '0'

unit consumption by giving credit of Rs.88431/- in the bill of Nov.2018.From March 2018 to Sept 2018 considering average of 960 units per month & credit of Rs.11021.11 is given in the bill of Dec.2018. (as per 15.4.1 MERC Supply Code Regulation of 2005).

6) Applicant submitted proof regarding non user of premises but did not submit any proof of his return journey back to Nagpur & he is silent about returning back. Also applicant signed spot inspection report dated 19.05.2018, This means applicant returned back in May 2018. It appears that applicant joined hands with meter reader to get relief.

7) During the course of arguments before the Forum, the applicant contended that disputed consumption as displayed by the meter does not commensurate with their actual usage of energy & that is because of a defect in meter (nodisplay).

8) Perusal of CPL since Nov. 2017 to Feb. 2018 shows consumption of 509, 509, 509, 509 Units with inaccessible status. In March 2018 consumption is shown on higher side 1692 units with faulty status. In April 2018 to Sept 2018 bill were continued to be issued on average basis for 1692 Units with faulty status. Upto March 2018 he paid bills regularly & after that he paid in Oct 2018 Rs.20000/-. So far as spot inspection report is concerned it shows that in May 2018, premises were in use.

As March 2018 to June 2018 is summer period therefore, it is but natural to have excess consumption.

9) Non applicant was directed to provide MRI report for meter from Manufacturer, but non applicant had submitted letter of the manufacturer regarding inability to provide MIR report, which is taken on records. It has to be accepted. Hence order passed by IGRC is legal and valid which needs no interference. Grievance application deserves to be dismissed. Hence following order.

ORDER

- 1) Grievance application is dismissed.
- 2) IGRC Order is confirmed.
- 3) No order as to cost.

Sd/-
(Mrs. Asmita A. Prabhune)
MEMBER(CPO)

sd/-
(Mrs. V.N.Parihar)
MEMBER SECRETARY

sd/-
(Arvind J. Rohee)
CHAIRPERSON