

CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
MAHARASHTRA STATE ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION COMPANY LTD.
NASHIK ZONE
(Established under the section 42 (5) of the Electricity Act, 2003)

Phone: 6526484
Fax: 0253-2591031
E.Mail: cgrfnsk@rediffmail.com

Office of the
Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum
Kharbanda Park, 1st Floor,
Room N. 115-118
Dwarka, NASHIK 422011

No. / CGRF /Nashik/NUC/N.U.Dn.1/755/08/2019-20/
(BY R.P.A.D.)

Date:

Date of Submission of the case : 04/04/2019

Date of Decision : 28/06/2019

To.

M/s. Navsanjeevani Hospital,
Plot No. 8, Motkari nagar,
Behind Tupsakhare Lawns, Tidke Colony,
Mumbai Naka Nashik 422002
(Consumer No. 049016044171)

Complainant

1. Nodal Officer ,
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Com. Ltd.,
Urban Circle office, Shingada Talav,
Nashik
2. Executive Engineer (U-1)
Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Com. Ltd.
Kharbanda Park Nashik .

Distribution Company
(Respondent)

DECISION

M/s. Navsanjeevani Hospital is the Public Service consumer of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. (hereafter referred as the Respondent). The Complainant has submitted grievance against MSEDCL for Excess billing . The Complainant filed a complaint regarding this with the Internal Grievance Redressal Committee of the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. Ltd. But not satisfied with the decision of the IGRC , the consumer has submitted a representation to the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum in Schedule "A". The representation is registered at Serial No.44 of 2018 on 04 /04/2019.

The Forum in its meeting on 04/04/2019, decided to admit this case for hearing on 10/05/2019 at 1.00 Pm in the office of the forum . A notice dated 12/04/2019 to that effect was sent to the appellant and the concerned officers of the Distribution Company. A copy of the grievance was also forwarded with this notice to the Nodal Officer, MSEDCL, Urban Circle Office Nashik for submitting para-wise comments to the Forum on the grievance within 15 days under intimation to the consumer.

Smt. P.V. Bankar , Nodal Officer/Ex. Engr. , Addl. Executive Engineer Shri. N.P. Ghumare , represented the Distribution Company during the hearing. Shri . Sachin Patil, Shri Harsha Mahatme appeared on behalf of the consumer.

A complaint from M/s. Sanjeevani Hospital through it one of the director was received for excess billing.

Say through the Nodal Officer Smt.P.V. Bankar has been received on behalf of MSEDCL challenging the claim raised by the complainant.

Consumers Representation in brief :

1. suo motu complaint given to Dist. Co. for under billing for the period of July 17 to Sept. 17 & Oct. 17 to Dec. 17.
2. A Grievance raised before IGRC did not yield fruits.

Arguments from the Distribution Company:

1. On receiving complaint the meter was tested & found faulty the meter was replaced on 25/12/2017, see further three months reading of consumption work recorded in newly meter.
2. On recording three months reading in the newly installed meter the average was applied to previous bill, which was issued on faulty meter reading. So the billed issued for previous months on faulty meter got reduced to more than as 50%. So complaint devoid of merit be rejected. The billing for the period July to Sept. 16 it was revised on the basis of average consumption of previous year that the same month was considered and awarded.

Similarly, for the period of Oct. to Dec. 2017 bill is revised on the basic of consumption recording after installation of new meter.

Decision :

Heard both parties perused the record it appear that the revised bill issued the period of July 17 to Sept. 17 was as per consumption recorded in previous year July to Sept. 2016 as per prevailing same circumstance so their appears to be no inconsistency or error.

Considering bill issue to Oct. to Dec.2017 it was issue on the average consumption recorded by the newly installed meter, recording the consumption from Jan. to Mar. 2018. In such method also there is no illegality or error but issued as per the norms of MERC.

Adopting to the dispute raised of processing cycle it shall be notice that, for the disputed period the processing cycle was PC-1 what was happening in such cycle was that if the meter reader reach the premises of the complainant for taking reading beyond 30 days, the reading taken was possibility of recording at the higher side, due to which the complainant consumption would land at the higher rate slab, thus causing the complainant to pay higher electric charges.

The Dist. Co. after installing the meter & considering their Grievances altered the processing for PC-1 to PC-0, which means that if the meter reader reaches the complainant premises for recording the consumption beyond 30 days at any time the reading taken would be of the 30th day i.e. 30 days consumption only. So the possibility of complainant consumption landing in higher rate slab it ruled out. Thus the Grievance of the complainant as to changing of the processing cycle also holds no ground and water.

The complainant appears to be genuine and regular paying public utility consumer & consuming sufficient energy in such circumstances we feel that the cost of litigations should be borne by both the parties of their own.

The net discussion supra results in to following order rejected.

Order

1. Complaint rejected.
2. As per regulation 8.7 of the MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006, order passed or direction issued by the Forum in this order shall be implemented by the Distribution Licensee within one month and the concerned Nodal Officer shall furnish intimation of such compliance to the Forum.
3. As per regulation 22 of the above mentioned regulations, non-compliance of the orders/directions in this order by the Distribution Licensee in any manner whatsoever shall be deemed to be a contravention of the provisions of these Regulations and the Maharashtra Electricity Regulatory Commission can initiate proceedings *suo motu* or on a complaint filed by any person to impose penalty or prosecution proceeding under Sections 142 and 149 of the Electricity Act, 2003.
4. If aggrieved by the non-redressal of his Grievance by the Forum, the Complainant may make a representation to the Electricity Ombudsman, 606, 'KESHAVA', Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400 051 within sixty (60) days from the date of this order under regulation 17.2 of the MERC (Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum & Electricity Ombudsman) Regulations, 2006.

(Smt. Vaishali V.Deole)
Member

(Prasad P. Bicchal)
Member Secretary

(Vivekkumar R.Agarwal)
Chairman

Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum Nashik Zone

Copy for information and necessary action to:

- 1 Chief Engineer , Nashik Zone, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Vidyut Bhavan, Nashik Road 422101 (For Ex. Engr.(Admn)
- 2 Chief Engineer , Nashik Zone, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Vidyut Bhavan, Nashik Road 422101 (For P.R.O)
- 3 Superintending Engineer, Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. , Urban Circle office, Nashik .

