

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Ajab Singh Rawat
House no. 9, Dharampur,
Ambiwala Gurudwara, P.O. Nehrugram
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

Vs

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

Representation No. 33/2018

Order

Date: - 30.11.2018

The petitioner, Shri Ajab Singh Rawat aggrieved by the order dated 11.07.2018 in complaint no. 67/2018 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum), in his complaint regarding jump in the bill of January/February 2018, for his residential connection, has complained before Ombudsman that he did not get any relief from the Forum whereas the check meter had established that his meter was recording more. While department changed his meter from meter no. 033590 to meter no. 71842327 no relief was given to him. The new meter is showing consumption of 500-600 units for 2 months and department has not paid heed to his complaint because of which he was delayed in approaching the Ombudsman office. He has therefore requested for justice in the matter.

2. Forum, in their order dated 11.07.2018, have recorded that based on the readings in the meter installed at petitioner's premises his per day consumption comes to 9.94 units based on the readings between 25.05.2018 and 12.06.2018. Similarly, the readings between 25.05.2018 and 25.06.2018 indicate a per day consumption of nearly 10 units. Forum concluded that in the billing cycle March 2018 his consumption of 1356 units is much higher than his consumption in previous 2 billing cycles of 11/2017 and 01/2018 which is 350 and 355 units respectively which clearly indicates that correct readings have not been reported in the billing cycles of

November 2017 and January 2018. Since the meter was found 4% fast based on the check meter reading, Forum directed that petitioner's bills for the period 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018 be revised @ 369 units monthly average. Forum also directed that his meter may be changed and disposed off the complaint.

3. The respondent, in their written statement, have only referred to petitioner accepting that a new meter has been established on his connection no. 9721229096261 and with reference to his demand for revision in his billing they have said that the bill for the period 18.09.2017 to 22.07.2018 has been amended and as proof, the letter of revision and the copy of ledger has been enclosed.
4. Both parties have been heard and record has been perused. A perusal of Forum order reveals that the respondent have duly submitted before the Forum that adjustment of Rs. 398-78 on account of Fast running of meter @ 4% has already been allowed in the bills of the petitioner. Forum in their order have noted that the existing meter was found running fast @ 4% but have still ordered to revise the bill for the period 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018 on the basis of average monthly consumption of 369 units, $(22765-20674) \times 30 / 172$, recorded consumption by the existing meter during the aforesaid period from 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018. Forum order is inconsistent with the relevant sub regulation 3.1.3 (v) of UERC (The Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2007. However the action taken by the respondents for revision of the bills for the period 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018 on account of fast running of meter and allowing adjustment of Rs. 398.78 is correct being consistent with the aforesaid regulation. The adjustment of Rs. 398.78 as a credit entry in the consumer ledger submitted by the respondent confirms their averment before the Forum. In order to further confirm the action of bill revision by the respondent, they were requested to supply appropriate calculation. The calculation sheet submitted by the respondent vide their letter dated 27.11.2018 confirms that adjustment on account of fast running of the meter has actually been given by the respondent not only for the period 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018 but till 25.05.2018, the date of replacement of the meter and the same is duly reflected in the ledger, and billing history. As revealed from the check meter study and also observed by the Forum, there was no fault in the meter except fast running @ 4% and as already mentioned above since the bill had already been revised by the respondent in accordance with the relevant regulation and further the

irregularity committed in issuing bills for 11/2017, 01/2018 and 3/2018 for 355 units, 305 units and 1356 units respectively, whereby benefit of different rate slabs under tariff could not be given, has now been set right by billing @ 359 units average consumption per month as against 369 units directed by Forum in addition to deducting Rs. 398.78 from his outstanding amount, the grievance of the petitioner stands redressed. Forum order regarding replacement of existing meter has also been duly complied with by the respondent by replacing the existing meter by check meter on 25.05.2018. Forum order regarding revision of bill @ 369 units per month for the period 18.09.2017 to 09.03.2018 on the basis of actual consumption recorded during the said period by the fast running existing meter and not ordering revision of bills for allowing benefit of fast running of meter @ 4% cannot be upheld, as such, not being consistent with relevant regulation 3.1.3 (v) of UERC (The Electricity Supply Code) Regulations, 2007. Petition is disposed off in terms of explanation above. Forum order in so far as it pertains to change of meter is upheld.

Dated: 30.11.2018

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman