

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Rajender Singh Tomar
S/o Shri Santram Tomar
231, Lane no. 2, Vansthali,
Ballupur, Dehradun
Uttarakhand

Vs

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

Representation No. 32/2018

Order

Date: 05.11.2018

The petitioner, Shri Rajender Singh Tomar has filed this appeal on the ground that his bill for the month of February 2018 has been excessive and he is not satisfied with the decision dated 31.08.2018 given by the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Garhwal zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) in complaint no. 85/2018.

2. Petitioner's case is that he had sold a large part of his house consisting of 7 rooms and a servant quarter on 16th May, 2014 leaving him with only 3 rooms in which 2 persons reside. In the order of the Forum the reading for the month of February 2012-13 has been taken as the basis and he has not been given an opportunity to submit his side of the story. He has requested that the decision be pronounced based on situation of May 2014 (presumably related to sale of part of his property) i.e. reading of February 2015, 2016 & 2017.
3. Forum, in their order dated 31.08.2018, have observed that opposite party have installed a check meter at the petitioner's premises on his request dated 28.03.2018 on 04.04.2018 which was finalized on 20.04.2018 and the main meter has been found to be correct. Accordingly, petitioner's claim that his meter is old and defective has not been proved correct. Further the meter was installed at the petitioner's premises in June 2014 and is therefore not old. However since the MRI could not be conducted on

his meter despite repeated efforts, Forum observed that installing a meter which is amenable to MRI will be reasonable so that an MRI can be conducted as necessary in the future. Since no fault was observed in the meter or the billing, Forum dismissed the complaint.

4. Respondent in their written statement, have observed that the disputed bill is for the period from 06.12.2017 to 22.02.2018 which is the period of peak winter. It is possible that various heating devices like a heater, blower, geyser, rod were used in excess which resulted in heavy consumption reflected in the bill of February 2018. The check meter installed on 04.04.2018 and finalized on 20.04.2018 did not find any difference with the main meter and therefore the main meter is correct and the bill for February 2018 is as per consumption. While the MRI of the meter could not be conducted, the details of maximum demand from the month of December 2017 to August 2018 have been given.
5. Both parties have been heard. While petitioner was represented by Shri Chaman Rana, SDO, Vasant Vihar represented respondent. While it is true that the bill for the month of February 2018 represents a jump in consumption, compared to the previous bills and the consumption pattern as indicated in the bills submitted, it is clear from the record that the meter is working correctly and the bills are in sequence. The petitioner's allegation that no opportunity was given to him to put up his explanation with regards to readings of February 2012-13 does not appear to be sustainable, firstly the Forum has not decided the case on the basis of readings for the aforesaid period, but have passed order on the basis of recorded consumption during the period of disputed bill i.e. 06.12.2017 to 21.02.2018 and secondly, as mentioned in the order itself, they have passed the order after hearing both parties. Further, as indicated by the respondent in their written statement, the details of maximum demand from the month of December 2017 to August 2018 indicate the load factor during the period of the disputed bill has been 30% which is quite reasonable having regard to the recorded maximum demand during this period being 4.08 KW and 3.40 KW in the month of 12/2017 and 02/2018 respectively. There is therefore no basis to suggest that excess recording by the meter during the period 06.12.2017 to 21.02.2018 is attributable to some fault in the meter as the meter working has been found OK in the

check meter study. As such there is no ground to interfere with the orders of the Forum and the same is upheld. The petition is dismissed.

Dated: 05.11.2018

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman