

## THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Smt. Manorama Jain  
W/o Shri Bholu Nath Jain  
Chow –Mandi, Kalu Ram Quarters,  
Railway Road, Roorkee,  
Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand

Vs

The Executive Engineer,  
Electricity Distribution Division (Urban),  
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.  
Civil Lines, Roorkee,  
Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 44/2013

### **Order**

The petitioner, Smt. Manorama Jain approached the office of Ombudsman with her petition dated 04.12.2013 received on 11.12.2013 against the order dated 13.10.2011 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) for false and erroneous electricity bills sent to the petitioner by Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as respondent). The petitioner also filed an application for condoning the delay in filing the petition. The petitioner claimed that she did not receive the order of the Forum on time and only received it on 08.06.2013 (nearly 18 months after the order was passed) in response to her third reminder dated 28.05.2013 to the Forum for expediting the order in her case. She had also marked a copy of her letter to the Chairman, Uttarakhand Electricity Regulatory Commission (hereinafter referred to as UERC). The UERC advised the petitioner, vide its letter dated 27.11.2013, to file an appeal against the decision of the Forum in the office of the Ombudsman. Thereafter she filed her petition in the office of the Ombudsman. Her plea was accepted and the case was admitted on 11.12.2013 condoning the delay.

2. In her complaint before the Forum the petitioner stated that she had an electricity connection no. 74688 since 17.08.1999. Till December 2005 she was receiving

regular bills and making regular payments. On 17.01.2006 the respondent changed the old meter and replaced it with a new electronic meter no. 74939. The petitioner claims that after installation of this new meter she started receiving incorrect bills. As an example, the petitioner has stated that she received a claim for Rs. 12,840.00 for the period 17.01.2006 to 08.04.2008. The SDO settled the payment from 17.01.2006 to 23.06.2008 on meter reading as 2100 units on that date. The petitioner made the payment of Rs. 5,871.00 on 25.07.2008. The petitioner further claims that again she started receiving erroneous bills. From 08/2008 to 11/2009 she received NA and IDF bills amounting to Rs. 10,972.00 which were revised

3. The petitioner has informed that the meter was again replaced on 16.01.2010 and this meter also is running very fast. The petitioner informed that despite she and her husband being very aged and heart patients, she contacted the respondent's office a number of times and made several requests for correction of the bills with no result. Failing to get any relief from the respondent, the petitioner approached the Forum for relief and to get the fast running meter deployed in January 2010 (no. 956395) replaced by a duly checked meter.
4. The Forum vide their order dated 13.10.2011 disposed off the complaint of the petitioner directing the petitioner to deposit the stipulated fees for check meter and directed the respondent to install a check meter at petitioner's premises after the petitioner deposits the stipulated fees for check meter and bill be issued accordingly. The Forum also concluded that the grievance of the petitioner can be rectified as per rules as per report of the respondent.
5. The respondent claimed that the bills of the petitioner from 17.01.2006 to 23.06.2008 were reassessed as a number of bills during this period were NA/IDF. A final reading was taken as 2100 units on 23.06.2008 and the amount reassessed as Rs. 5,871.00 as against the earlier demand of Rs. 13,361.00. The petitioner paid Rs. 5,871.00 on 25.07.2008. The petitioner however did not pay Rs. 2,878.00 towards consumption from 23.06.2008 to 25.07.2008 showing consumption of 773 units (total units 2873 on the meter). Subsequently NR bills were issued from October 2008 to April 2009 and IDF bill for May/June 2009. Thereafter bill for 10 months from August 2008 to May 2009 for assessed units 2000 @ 200 units per month, was served to the petitioner in

June 2009, after adjusting the NR bills. Thus electricity bill for 10 months from 08/2008 to 05/2009 for assessed units of 2000 units was served to the petitioner after adjusting units of NR bills. Similarly for the period of IDF bills from June 2009 to December 2009 assessment @ 200 units per month was done.

6. Thus the total number of units consumed as per this formula from August 2008 to November 2009 = 3200 units for 16 months. The total due from the petitioner from 23.06.2008 to November 2009 was Rs. 10,972.00 (773 units from 23.06.2008 to 25.07.2008 and 3200 units from August 2008 to November 2009).
7. The respondent states that the meter of the petitioner which had become defective in June 2009 was replaced in January 2010. The bills were being issued on the basis of actual metered consumption from January 2010 till 06/2013. The connection was disconnected in July 2013 due to nonpayment of dues. The respondent informed that the IDF bills of 2009 had been further revised by adjustment of Rs. 2,339.00 including LPS in the bill for 09/2013. Further adjustment of Rs. 931.00 on account of LPS had been allowed in the bill for 12/2013. The total outstanding dues against the petitioner as on January 1, 2014 is Rs. 24,010.00.
8. The Forum had advised that the petitioner get a check meter installed for checking the correctness of the meter installed at his premises in January 2010. The petitioner did not apply for check meter, as ordered by the Forum.
9. During hearing on 25.02.2014 the respondent submitted consumer history showing month wise details of bills from 02/2008 to 02/2014. Even though the connection was disconnected in July 2013, since it was not a permanent disconnection (PD) billing continued. The total amount payable by the petitioner till 02/2014 was Rs. 24,667.00 which after adjustment came to Rs. 24,092.00. The petitioner was satisfied with the assessment and agreed to pay the same. The petitioner handed over cheque no. 446115 of I.O.B., Civil Lines, Roorkee for the amount of Rs. 24,092.00 in favour of EE, EDD (Urban), Roorkee to Shri Pankaj Kumar Thapliyal, SDO before the court. The dispute stands settled.

Dated: 04.04.2014

(Renuka Muttoo)  
Ombudsman