

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Jahid
S/o Shri Sabbir
Village Bharapur,
Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand

Vs

The Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Division (Urban),
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.,
Civil Lines, Roorkee,
Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 07/2020

Order

Dated:17.07.2020

Being aggrieved with Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Haridwar zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) order dated 11.02.2020 in his complaint no. 06/2020 before the said Forum against Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. (UPCL) through its Executive Engineer, Electricity Distribution Division (Urban), Roorkee (respondent), Shri Jahid S/o Shri Shabbir R/o Village Bharapur Distt. Haridwar has preferred this appeal for corrections of his bills.

2. The petitioner has preferred an undated appeal received in the office of Ombudsman on 17.02.2020 followed by a revised appeal dated 11.03.2020. The appellat has averred that he has a domestic connection no. 682/BB02/161469 for 1 KW under BPL category. All bills up to February 2018 stands paid fully on an average he had been getting bills amounting to Rs. 800-1000 for consumption ranging from 150 units to 200 units per bill. Bill for the month of April 2018 amounting to Rs. 2,828.00 could have not been paid (as per bill submitted by the petitioner this was the bill for the period 08.04.2018 to 18.06.2018). He has further stated that in the month of June 2018 the department had shown the reading 18346 and consumption $(18346-7272) = 11074$ units and a bill of Rs. 70,000.00 was given to him for the period 18.06.2018 to 12.10.2018. According to him this high consumption of 11074 units in just 2 months was not possible for his connection of 1 KW under BPL category and thus according to him this high consumption is attributable to high jump in the meter. In spite of

repeated requests to the department including a written request dated 15.03.2019 his problem was not resolved by the department and hence he lodged a complaint before Forum, which was registered there as complaint no. 06/2020. He has alleged that the Forum has decided his case in a hurry in just 2 hearings and in the absence of Member (Technical). He has therefore requested that his case may be decided on the lines of the case no. 57/2019 of Smt. Mehrumi W/o Shri Saheed decided by the said Forum vide order dated 27.05.2019 and his bills be ordered to be revised accordingly.

3. The Forum after hearing both parties and written replies by the opposite party wherein they have informed that the bill has been revised to Rs. 44,836.00 as per departmental rules. The Forum has mentioned that the complainant has also shown his consent to the revised bill, as such the Forum have ordered that since the opposite party has resolved the complaint by issuing the revised bill as aforesaid they have allowed the complaint and have disposed off the same.
4. The respondent, Executive Engineer has submitted his written statement on 12.05.2020 wherein he has simply stated that in disposal of the complaint of the petitioner the SDO II Roorkee had submitted a revised bill amounting to Rs. 44,836.00 before the Forum and made it available to the consumer. He (the complainant) had shown his consent on the revised bill and the Forum have accordingly disposed off the complaint vide their order dated 11.02.2020. He has also submitted a copy of SDO's letter dated 04.02.2020, billing history from 30.10.2014 to 05.12.2019 and calculations for revision of the bills.
5. The petitioner has submitted his rejoinder dated 06.06.2020 in which no new facts have been adduced except what he had already mentioned in his appeal. Hearing in the case was held on 06.07.2020. Both parties were present. The petitioner was represented by his authorized representative Shri Naseem and Shri B. S. Panwar SDO cum AE(R) appeared on behalf of the respondent. Both parties argued their case. The arguments were concluded with mutual consent.
6. After hearing the arguments from both parties and perusal of records available on file, it is borne out that 1 KW domestic connection no. 682BB02161469 was released to the petitioner on 19.08.2014. There was no dispute on bills till the bill dated 18.06.2018 for 164 metered units from reading 7108 to 7272 for a sum of Rs.

2,828.00. In the next bill dated 14.08.2018 for the period 18.06.2018 to 14.08.2018 metered units have been shown 11074 from reading 7272 to 18346. This bill has however been issued for 1600 units only on CDF basis amounting to Rs. 11,073.00 including arrear amounting to Rs. 2,828.00. Subsequently bill dated 12.10.2018 has been issued for the period 18.06.2018 to 12.10.2018 that is for 4 months for 12191 metered units from reading 7272 to 19436 amounting to Rs. 70, 506.00 including arrear Rs. 2,828.00. The earlier bill dated 14.08.2018 stands deleted and the petitioner's grievance is on this bill of dated 12.10.2018.

7. The respondent has submitted before the Forum as also with their written statement before Ombudsman that they have revised the bills right from the date of connection (19.08.2014) till December 2019 on average basis for all the metered consumption recorded by the meter installed at the date of release of connection till 06/2019 and the new meter installed in the month of 06/2019 the total consumption (19462 + 485) = 19947 units on average basis on appropriate tariff without LPS for Rs. 88,124.00 instead of Rs. 1,45,153.00 as shown in the billing history and thus a relief of Rs. 57,029.00 has been allowed and after adjustment of Rs. 43,288.00 paid by the petitioner the net payable outstanding dues up to 12/2019 have been worked out as Rs. 44,836.00 only. This revision is however not reflected in the billing history. The respondent's representative has committed that the revised bill as aforesaid shall be issued shortly and ledger shall be updated accordingly. The respondent executive engineer has now submitted letter 1419 dated 13.07.2020 via email received on 14.07.2020 which is taken on record, wherein the calculations for revision of the bills has again been submitted and a copy of the ledger from 01.04.2020 to 14.07.2020 has also been submitted in which adjustment due to revision of bill has been incorporated and closing balance dues against the consumer has been shown as Rs. 44,947.00. This confirms that the revision of the bill has duly been incorporated in consumer's ledger account.
8. With the issue of revised bill as aforesaid the petitioner's grievance stands redressed and no further relief is admissible to him. He is, therefore, liable to pay a sum of Rs. 44,947.00 as on date to UPCL. There is no ground to interfere with Forum's order and the same is upheld. The petition is dismissed. Interim stay granted on 08.05.2020 stands vacated. It is also clarified that he does not qualify to be a consumer under BPL

category as his consumption is more than the sealing of 60 units per month fixed for BPL category. Further his request that his case be decided on the lines of the case of Smt. Mehrumi W/o Shri Saheed (complaint no. 57/2019 decided by the Forum vide order dated 27.05.2019) for the facts of this case being at variance, and secondly his grievance stands redressed in the order itself.

9. It is however directed that facility of payment in installments may be granted as per departmental rules if the petitioner requests for the same.
10. Although this order was due for issue on 16.07.2020, but, the said date having been declared as gazette holiday vide Government of Uttarakhand notification no. 217/xxi(15)G/2020-74 (सग0)/2016 dated 02.03.2020, this order is being issued today i.e. 17.07.2020.

Dated: 17.07.2020

(Subhash Kumar)
Ombudsman