

## THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Manjeet Singh Rana  
S/o Shri Rana Prakash Singh  
Wing No. 4/6/1, Premnagar,  
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

The Executive Engineer,  
Electricity Distribution Division (Rural),  
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.,  
359/2, Dharampur, Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 12/2017

### Order

The petitioner Shri Manjeet Singh Rana has filed this petition against the order dated 31.03.2017 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum).

2. Petitioner's case is that while he has connection no. 9722121012280 with a sanctioned load of 5 KW he had been getting excessive bills for the month of February, March, May and July, much more than his average consumption especially at a time when he and his family were travelling outside Dehradun and there was nobody at home in the month of May June and July. While he had given oral complaints he also gave a letter dated 30.08.2016 to the JE/SDO on which department took no action. On 12.09.2016 his meter was stolen about which he complained on the toll free number and also in the Premnagar police station. Since bill was not being corrected petitioner filed a complaint before the Forum on 27.01.2017. Petitioner is satisfied with the order of the Forum with regard to second part of his complaint after the meter was stolen for which he has expressed gratitude but for the excessive bills given to him earlier, no orders have been passed, and hence petitioner has approached the Ombudsman.
3. The Forum, in their order, have referred to the petitioner's complaint regarding bills for excessive consumption and a request for correcting them, but have dwelt largely on the second part of the complaint pertaining to theft of the meter and decision

regarding readings of the meter which is no longer available due to theft of meter on 12.09.2016. The petitioner has no grievance regarding this order, his only grievance is that the first part of his complaint has not been addressed by the Forum which may now be addressed.

4. Respondent UPCL, in their written statement, have contested the petitioner's claim that he had repeatedly asked the department to correct his bills or that the department informed the petitioner that it will make enquiries and then correct the bill. They have also contested the claim that the bills for March, May and July were excessive since they have stated that they are as per consumption and it is wrong to allege that in these 3 months the petitioner and his family were out of station and nobody was living in the house. Respondent have also highlighted the point that in case the petitioner was concerned about the high bills he could have stated grounds to challenge them or challenge the accuracy of the meter or apply for installation of check meter after depositing requisite fee. He has done none of these things. Finally, respondent have also highlighted that petitioner has, in his application, dated 04.02.2017 made vague allegation about sometimes high and sometimes low consumption bills which was allegedly due to defective meter and there was only oral complaint to the JE concerned. Since the petitioner has a connection of 5 KW and bills have been issued as per consumption, they cannot be corrected on the basis of average on mere allegations of the petitioner.
5. Arguments preferred by both parties have been heard and record available perused. The consumer history filed by the respondent indicates clearly that the four number bills alleged to be wrong as consumption in these bills are higher than his previous average consumption is not established because all these bills have been issued on metered consumption and since the petitioner had never challenged accuracy of the meter and neither applied for installation of a check meter, his case is not sustainable and no revision of the bills is therefore admissible. His prayer for correction/revision of these bills is therefore turned down.
6. While the Forum has rightly decided the matter regarding issue of bills for the period 27.07.2016 to 22.12.2016 during which period no consumption records are available with the respondent due to the theft of meter on 12.09.2016, and further due to non installation of a new meter till 22.12.2016, and the same is upheld, but it is noted that

the Forum did not give any finding and decision on his first grievance regarding excessive bills and the same grievance has now been addressed and decided in this order as per above paragraph. Forum order, amplified as above, is upheld. Petition is dismissed.

Dated: 28.07.2017

(Vibha Puri Das)  
Ombudsman