

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

Case No. CGRF(NZ)/141/2018

Applicant : Nagarjuna Training Institute,
User – Dhammchari Tejdarshan,
Naglok, Near Akashwani Relay Kendra,
Bhilgaon, Tah – Kamptee,
Dist – Nagpur-441401.

Non-applicant : Nodal Officer,
The Executive Engineer,
Mouda Dn., M.S.E.D.C.L.,
Mouda.

Applicant represented by : Shri T. B. Ukey,

Non-applicant represented by: 1) Shri Amit Paranjpe, Exe.Engr.,
MSEDCL,
2) Shri D.B. Madne, DY.E.E.

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 30-03-2019

1) The applicant filed present grievance application before this Forum on 26.12.2018 under Regulation 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 07.02.2019 & 20.02.2019.
- 3) Forum heard arguments of both the sides & perused record.
- 4) The applicant having consumer No. 410130030169 has LT – 3 Phase Residential Connection. Applicant's electric supply was disrupted on 02.07.2018 at 19.00 hours. A complaint was lodged over mobile phone. The concern technician of MSEDCL attended complaint & told applicant that fault is due to service cable. Service cable was damaged at 2-3 points. Cable was not available with MSEDCL. Hence applicant purchased the service cable & laying of service cable work was done. The supply was restored on 04.07.2018. Applicant prayed for reimbursement of cost of service cable, excavation charges & diesel charges for generator amounting to Rs.43164/- & compensation for delay in restoration of supply by two days from 02.07.2018 (7 PM) to 04.07.2018 (5.30 PM) as per SOP regulations 2014.
- 5) Non applicant in reply stated that applicant did not make any complaint regarding replacement of faulty cable nor had taken proper estimate for cable replacement work from MSEDCL office. As per MERC supply Code 3.3.2 there is a provision of supply to premises which entails work of laying of service line from the distributing main to the applicant's premises & the Distribution Licensee shall be authorized to recover all expenses reasonably incurred on such work from the applicant.

6) As approved in Case No. 70 of 2005 dt. 8.9.2007 by MERC, It is obvious that, MSEDCL is entitled to recover the charges from applicant under the head SCC (Service Connection Charges) as per the schedule of charges approved by Commission for underground connection for motive power upto 50 KW i.e. either Rs.14,000/- or 1.3% as supervision charges in case MSEDCL permits applicant to carry out work through License Electrical Contractor. Hence in fact applicant should have asked non applicant to complete work by paying SCC charges but applicant had carried out works since required cable was not available with the MSEDCL. During the hearing, it was contended by the Non applicant that cable laid is of higher capacity than requirement. As applicant has purchased the oversize cable without non applicant asking for it and therefore incurred exorbitant cost, hence there is no question of its reimbursement to the applicant.

7) It is obvious from record that it is a primary responsibility of MSEDCL to replace the service cable line if it was found damaged and recover its charges from consumer. Instead of doing that and in order to avoid delay, NA permitted the applicant to purchase the cable and it was installed by the NA. As such there is no question of reimbursement of any amount of expenses incurred by the applicant. Further there is no record to show that the applicant has carried out the work of installation of cable through be Licensed Electrical Contractor. For these reasons also there is no

question of grant of any reimbursement or compensation for so called delay to the applicant. The work of installation of cable appears to have been done under supervision of MSEDCL. As per schedule of charges with effect on 08.09.2007, the NA may recover 1.3% of the normative charges from the Applicant towards supervision charges.

8) We do not find any force in the contentions of the applicant that the provisions of clause 3.3.2 of MERC supply code are applicable for the first installation of cable only at the time of grant of new electric connection and not to subsequent occasions when replacement of service cable is found necessary. This follows that on every occasion of installation replacement of service line cable NA is entitled to recover cost of cable and other charges incurred from the consumer.

9) For the above reasons we do not find any merit in the present grievance application. Hence the following order.

ORDER

- 1) The grievance application stands rejected.
- 2) No order as to cost.

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

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

Sd/-
(Arvind J. Rohee)
CHAIRPERSON