

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Avinash Sharma
C/o Shri Suraj Prakash Gulati
S/o Late Shri Roshan Lal Gulati
77, Shivalik Puram, GMS Road,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

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

Representation No. 09/2018

Order

Date: - 30.05.2018

The petitioner, Shri Avinash Sharma appearing on behalf of Shri Suraj Prakash Gulati, owner of connection no. HD61635079655 has filed this petition aggrieved by the order dated 19.02.2018 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) in complaint no. 191/2017.

2. Petitioner's case is that his meter was changed on 05.05.2017 on the basis of departmental report. While petitioner noted the reading in the new meter on 20.06.2017 which was showing 325 units and accordingly requested respondent to give a bill which was given as bill no. 476170707000006 dated 20.06.2017 and in accordance with which petitioner deposited the bill amount on 10.07.2017. Petitioner is aggrieved that in the month of June and July 2017 he has been given bills 5 times and 11 times the average of previous rates of consumption. This is particularly surprising since in the month of August, September and October the consumption has again reverted to the normal levels. Petitioner's averment that the bill no. 21708172097 dated 16.08.2017 if the earlier reading of 325 is deducted from the present reading of 5409, the billed units would come to 5084. However the billed units in the bill are shown as 4800, which is incorrect. Petitioner feels that MRI report cannot be relied upon since in its report of 01.08.2017 it is showing consumption of

3488 units and if the consumption as on 16.08.2017 is recorded as 5084 (while the bill has recorded only 4800 because of the CDF) then it would mean that in 15 days his consumption comes to 1595.60 units which is debatable because his sanctioned load is 3 KW and there is no AC in the building. Accordingly, he has alleged that the MRI report is fabricated and false and requested that the order of the Forum be set aside and although the imposed bill have been deposited for fear of disconnection, the same may be refunded with due compensation.

3. Forum, in their order dated 19.02.2017, have heard the parties and explained that since the petitioner had complained about his meter running fast respondent had installed a check meter on 23.08.2017 which was finalized on 30.10.2017 and recorded that there was no difference between the two meters. However, the meter no. 63188052 was replaced by meter no. 6321096. The MRI of the old meter has shown a monthly consumption in the range of 269 to 325 units for the months of May 2017, August 2017, September 2017 and October 2017. However for the months of June 2017 and July 2017, the consumption recorded is 1447.08 and 3488.40 units respectively. Forum have also given peak loads (maximum demands) recorded in these 2 months as 7.31 KW on 29.06.2017 and 9.28 KW on 13.07.2017 whereas in the months of May 2017, August 2017, September 2017 and October 2017 the same meter has recorded maximum demand between 0.97 to 2.2 KW. Accordingly Forum concluded that since the MRI recorded the actual consumption by the consumer, there could be no interference in the bills given and dismissed petition.
4. The respondent in their written statement have countered the points raised by the petitioner and explained that the MRI is machine generated and without any human interface. Regarding bills on average consumption, respondent have pointed out that the petitioner has been given bill on average consumption only when the meter was defective. All other bills have been as per units consumed. Since the billing is as per consumption and only for the bill for August 2017 billed units were 5084 but 4800 was shown since at 3 KW load the maximum units that can be billed is 4800 and therefore bill has been raised as per CDF. They have therefore rejected the allegations of MRI being false or fabricated and have requested that Forum order needs to be upheld.

5. The parties were heard and the record available has been perused. Respondent were called upon to indicate the connected load at the premises of the petitioner as well as the load survey report for the period 05.05.2017 to 30.10.2017, which has duly been submitted by them vide their letter dated 07.05.2018.
6. Connected load at site during joint inspection dated 03.05.2018 has been found to be 9.6 KW. The maximum demand recorded on 29.06.2017 was 7.31 KW and on 13.07.2017 was 9.28 KW and consumption in the months of July 2017 is 3488.40 units and in June 2017 is 1447.80 units. As mentioned in Forum order meter no. 63188052 has been found to be running correctly and MRI reading of consumption justify billing. Hence, petitioner's allegation that the MRI report is fabricated and false cannot be sustained and further considering the connected load of 9.6 KW there is no reason to doubt possibility of such consumption and demand.
7. In the above mentioned sequence of events, there is no reason to interfere with order of Forum, which is upheld. Petition is dismissed.

Dated: 30.05.2018

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman