

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Amarjeet Singh Bhatia
146, Lane no. 8, Rajeshwar Nagar,
Phase 1, IT Park
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

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

Representation No. 02/2018

Order

Date: - 17.04.2018

The petitioner, Shri Amarjeet Singh Bhatia (consumer Smt. Veenu Bhatia meter connection no. 971/1314/404124) is aggrieved by the order dated 21.12.2017 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) in complaint no. 136/2017 in which the Forum have allowed the complaint. Petitioner is aggrieved that they have not been told what amount is due from them, whereas they have already paid the requisite bill and their second grievance is that no meter reader is coming in their area. He has requested that a proper letter indicating settlement of dues and also deputing a meter reader be given to him.

2. Forum, in their order have observed that there is great discrepancy in the bills of different periods which suggest that bills have not been issued on the basis of actual consumption and therefore Forum caused an MRI to be conducted and also took note of the fact that contrary to petitioner's claim that a check meter had not been installed, despite his depositing fees for the check meter, check meter was installed and the main meter was found working correctly. Since the petitioner has requested for enhancement of load from 3 KW to 5 KW, his meter was changed on 30.10.2015 at reading 1723 and new 3 phase meter at initial reading 03 was installed. Reading of this meter, on 12.10.2017, has been given as 7615. Based on the MRI and the check meter report, Forum concluded that the problem was as the petitioner has alleged in the meter reading not being taken properly and therefore directed in their order that bills be revised for the period 28.12.2014 to 30.10.2015 for meter no. 40131955 on actual average and for the period 30.10.2015 to 12.10.2017 for meter no. 15476851 on

actual monthly consumption as per MRI on appropriate tariff without levy of LPS and allowing adjustment of the amount already paid. Respondent was also directed to post a meter reader on a permanent basis to enable realistic bills to be issued for the consumers.

3. Respondent in their written statement have stated that bill of consumer Smt. Veenu Bhatia connection no. 9711314404124 has been revised according to MRI and monthly consumption as per Forum's order. They have also informed that adjustment of Rs. 3,621.00 has been allowed on 24.01.2018 and bill for the month of January 2018 issued on 09.02.2018 with bill amount Rs. 5,017.00. They have also informed that Shri Manjeet from a Self Help Group has been deputed as a meter reader in the area, Rajeshwarnagar, and he has been instructed to take readings properly. A calculation sheet signed by Executive Engineer and supporting staff has also been given which shows a (-) balance of Rs. 3,621.00 as on 12.10.2017.
4. Arguments have been heard and the record available on file has been perused. During arguments petitioner raised the issue of LPS not having been adjusted as per the Forum order and solar rebate not having been allowed. He also gave a photograph indicating the height at which the meter was positioned which would make reading very difficult if not impossible. It was argued on behalf of the respondent that the meter has been positioned appropriately and no LPS has been charged in the revised calculation. Extract of the consumer ledger up to 05.04.2018 indicates that latest bill of February has been paid and negative balance of (-) Rs. 208.10 obtains. It is noticed from the calculation sheet showing (-) Rs. 3621.00 as balance as on 12.10.2017, that opening balance as on 27.10.2016 has been shown as Rs. 587.00. The billing history shows that no LPS is included in the opening balance of Rs. 587.00. Hence it is clear that no LPS has been charged up to 12.10.2017. The calculation sheet also reveals that solar rebate to the tune of Rs. 4,500 from 29.07.2016 (for 15 months @ Rs. 300.00 per month) has been allowed. It is therefore clear that all the reliefs that the petitioner has sought had already been allowed in the order of the Forum and the order has been complied with by the respondent as is clear from the calculation sheet submitted. There is no cause to interfere with the order of the Forum, which is upheld. Petition is accordingly disposed off.

Dated: 17.04.2018

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman