

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Dinesh Bhatnagar
F-408, Aditya Doon saayar,
Sai Lok, Phase 2, GMS Road
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Division (South),
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.
18, EC Road, Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 42/2017

Order

The petitioner, Shri Dinesh Kumar Bhatnagar has filed this petition against the order dated 08.12.2016 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) as well as another order dated 28.03.2017 (actual date is 25.03.2017) issued by the same Forum for implementation of the earlier order. Petitioner is aggrieved that despite these two orders he has not received the rectified bill for the period June/July 2016 for which, according to him, he has received excess bill of 808 units. In both orders of the Forum, UPCL has been directed to issue rectified bill within a period of one week from the date of the order. Petitioner believes that the meter had become faulty in that period because of which it gave exaggerated reading which is revealed from his billing history that his bill for 2 months cycle has never exceeded 400 units. Petitioner has also raised the query that in case the meter was not faulty why it was replaced by the check meter without his consent and in his absence. He has therefore requested that the excess meter reading may be rectified as per his consumption history and rectified bill for June/July may be issued.

2. The Forum in their order dated 08.12.2016 taking cognizance of the basic complaint of the petitioner that the bill for the period 07.06.2016 to 04.08.2016 for 800 units is much more than his normal average, called for the MRI report and Test Lab report for

the meter. While the Test Lab report has indicated that meter no. 324497 is correct as per laid down parameters of testing, the MRI report gives actual consumption of 166, 321 and 427 for the months June, July and August respectively. Petitioner's consumption for the month of September came down to 263 and subsequently consumption remained low. Forum concluded therefore that the billing should be as per the MRI since MRI report is now available. Accordingly, they directed that bills issued to the petitioner may be corrected from April 2016 to the present according to the MRI while adjusting amounts deposited so far in a period of 1 week. Since the order of the Forum was not complied with by the opposite party, UPCL, petitioner approached the Forum once again on 17.02.2017 requesting for a copy of the MRI and compliance of the order issued by the Forum. Having heard both parties through the प्रकीर्ण परिवाद संख्या 50/2016 Forum passed an order on 25.03.2017 again requiring opposite party to modify the bills of petitioner w.e.f. April 2016 to the present as per the MRI report within a period of 1 week. Petitioner was directed to pay the demanded amount within 2 weeks thereafter and opposite party were also directed to file compliance report in the Forum within 2 weeks. None of these actions was completed in the prescribed time as the petitioner was constrained to approach the Ombudsman for relief.

3. The respondent in their written statement have asserted that according to the MRI on the meter established at the residence of petitioner 271 units have been shown consumed in April/May 748 units in June/July and 386 units in August/September. They have also indicated that the Real Time Clock (RTC) of the meter was defective and therefore the main meter was removed and check meter made the main meter as is the general practice. Respondent have also affirmed that they have in compliance of the Forum order issued modified bill for the consumer. In his rejoinder to this statement petitioner averred on 13.12.2017 that respondent have not complied with the orders dated 08.12.2016 and 25.03.2017 as he has not been given any amended bill according to those orders.
4. The record available on file has been carefully perused and the arguments preferred by both parties have been heard. The following points emerge from this discussion
 - a) Respondent have filed an averment before the Forum on 01.03.2017 indicating that they have complied with the order of the Forum and enclosing therewith

some hand written corrections to bills of 06.04.2016 to 01.10.2016. Forum have also taken note of this compliance report but this adjustment has escaped mention in their order dated 25.03.2017.

- b) However, petitioner's contention is that no revised bill as per the forum order has been served on him and his grievance persists.
- c) Consumer ledger details and consumer history were called for from respondent which reveals that on account of revision of the bills from 06.04.2016 to 01.10.2016 on MRI readings, adjustment of Rs 8 as extra payment by petitioner has been allowed in his account on 01.03.2017 as per orders of the Forum. The same has been communicated vide bill of 7th April and settled by petitioner on 19.04.2017. Hence petitioner's grievance stands redressed.

5. As such, no further relief is admissible to the petitioner and the petition is dismissed. Forum order dated 08.12.2016 is upheld. Forum order dated 25.03.2017 is infructuous in view of compliance report of 01.03.2017 submitted before Forum

Dated: 05.01.2018

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman