

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Paramjit Singh
Auto Zone,
Tedi Puliya, Nainital Road,
Haldwani, Distt. Nainital, Uttarakhand.

Vs

Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Division (Urban),
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.
Tikoniya, Haldwani, Distt. Nainital, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 35/2018

Order

Date: - 29.01.2019

The petitioner, Shri Paramjit Singh has filed this petition no. 35/2018 against the order dated 05.10.2018 in complaint no. 55/2018 of the Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kumaon zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum).

2. Petitioner's case is that he has a connection for his concern, Auto zone, and his monthly bill has been 300-500 units but suddenly in the month of May 2017 his consumption shown in the bill shot up to 2672 units. When he asked for the MRI report the department replied that his meter has been sent to store and it is not possible to get the MRI. Petitioner has stated that he does not agree with the logic used in the Forum order that for a 8 KW connection the maximum monthly consumption could be 5760 units and has requested that Forum order which is unilateral and penalizing in nature, be set aside and that he should be given a bill on average units used before May 2017 and after May 2017.
3. Forum, in their order dated 05.10.2018, have recorded that respondent installed a check meter on the meter of the petitioner on 07.09.2017, finalised on 04.01.2017 (probably 04.10.2017). Petitioner's meter was found to be 5.45% slow. As such an assessment of Rs. 1458.00 was made out. The complaint of the petitioner has been stated as false and no amendment is considered possible. While the Forum have agreed with the respondent statement that the meter is not available as it has been

consigned to the store having completed its guaranteed life, but have also observed that with a sanctioned load of 8 KW the maximum monthly consumption could be $8 \times 24 \times 30 = 5760$ units and since no reasonable grounds for modifying the bill have been adduced, Forum dismissed the complaint.

4. Respondent, in their written statement dated 05.12.2018, have stated basically what they have stated before the Forum that while it is true that a bill for 2672 units has been given for the month of May 2017 against connection no. 3866101085605 which connection was sanctioned on 13.07.2012 (which has subsequently been corrected to say 30.01.2001 vide letter dated 15.01.2019) have asserted that the bill is correct whereas the meter which has been checked with a check meter is found to be 5.45% slow. Since the meter was slow and has been changed, petitioner cannot be given bills as per average readings of previous meter and hence respondent have argued that the petitioner is not entitled to any relief and his petition may be dismissed.
5. Date (10.01.2019) was fixed for arguments but petitioner sent a letter to say that his case may be decided on the basis of documents already filed and he will not be able to be present for the hearing. During hearing, respondent have, apart from correcting the date of connection as stated above, also mentioned that the same meter had continued from January 2009 but sealing certificate being very old was not available. A perusal of the consumer history reveals that bills from 22.02.2011 to 19.11.2018 had been on metered units and consumption has varied significantly showing as high as 4170 units in 09/2013, 3212 units in 01/2012, and 1165 units in 10/2014 etc. The said meter has been checked against a check meter, found to be slow and replaced. Consumer history shows consumption in similar range earlier and no other fault or basis for doubting the meter reading has been presented. On the contrary, the meter has been found slow. In such a situation the request of the petitioner does not carry any weight and as observed by the Forum, he cannot be considered entitled to any revision of the bill or any relief. Forum order is correct and is upheld. Petition is dismissed.

Dated: 29.01.2019

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman