

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL FORUM
B.E.S. & T. UNDERTAKING

(Constituted under section 42(5) of Electricity Act 2003)

Ground Floor, Multistoried Annex Building,
BEST's Colaba Depot
Colaba, Mumbai - 400 001

Telephone No. 22853561

Representation No. N -F(N)-202-2013 dtd. 19/07/2013

M/s Himatlal Tribhovandas Shah & CoComplainant

V/S

B.E.S.&T. UndertakingRespondent

Present

Quorum : Chairman
Shri R U Ingule, Chairman

Member
1. Shri M P Thakkar, Member
2. Shri S M Mohite, Member

On behalf of the Complainant : 1. Shri Rajesh H. Gosalia

On behalf of the Respondent : 1. Shri. M.Y. Shethwala, Supdt. CC(F/N)
2. Shri. D.K. Lambhate, AAM CC(F/N)
3. Shri. D.T. Malvankar, Supervisor

Date of Hearing : 05/09/2013

Date of Order : 06/09/2013

Judgment by Shri. R.U. Ingule, Chairman

M/s Himatlal Tribhovandas Shah & Co., C-314, Antop Hill Warehousing Complex, VIT College Road, Wadala (E), Mumbai - 400 037 has come before the Forum for dispute regarding high bill in the month of December 2012 pertaining to meter no. J097504, A/c 770-191-233*6. This meter was replaced by meter no. M822335 on 26/07/2013. Old meter J097504 found defective (no display).

Complainant has submitted in brief as under :

1.0 The complainant has approached to IGR Cell on 07/05/2013 for grievance regarding bill raised in the month of December 2012 pertaining to A/c 770-191-233. The complainant has approached to CGRF in schedule 'A' dtd. 13/07/2013 (received by CGRF on 16/07/2013) as no remedy is provided by the Distribution Licensee regarding his grievance. The complainant has requested the Forum to reduce the outstanding bill.

Respondent, BEST Undertaking in its written statement
in brief submitted as under :

2.0 This case is regarding high bill in the month of Dec 2012 pertaining to meter no J097504. This meter was replaced by meter M822335 on 26/07/2013. Old meter No. J097504 found defective (no display).

3.0 In the complaint letter, the complainant said that he has received high bill from the month of December 2012. He has requested to correct his wrong bill. After investigation it was observed that the consumer was billed '0' units for 12 months i.e. from April 2011 to March 2012. Since the reading of the defective meter are not reliable right from the installation of the meter. The correction of the bill can be done after availability of average of replaced meter. Since old meter found defective from its installation.

4.0 At the outset no reply was given to the complainant's letter under Annexure 'C' as the complainant has put up two complaints under Annexure 'C' for his two different consumer numbers which are received on the same date. The format and the type of complaint were similar, therefore, inadvertently both the complaints made by the consumer were considered one and the same and only one complaint was replied.

REASONS

5.0 We have heard Shri Rajesh Gosalia for the complainant and for the Respondent BEST Undertaking Shri M.Y. Shethwala, Supdt. CC(F/N), Shri. D.K. Lambhate, AAM CC(F/N). Perused papers.

6.0 At the outset this Forum finds on going through the papers and contentions, that the instant complains has been filed at a *premature* stage by the complainant.

7.0 We may observe that the complainant has *inter-alia* alleged that he has lodged two grievances with the Respondent BEST Undertaking regarding over reading of the meter and raising of heavy charges. His complaint about raising a high bill due to defect in a meter has not been attended yet and as such the heavy charges have been shown as an outstanding amount in every subsequent bill till this date.

8.0 The Respondent BEST Undertaking by filing this written statement has submitted that as the complainant has disputed for receiving an electricity bill on a higher side, investigation was carried out and the meter was found defective due to display was not visible, hence the same has been replaced by new meter no. M822335 on

26/07/2013. The amendment, if any, required can only be done by the Respondent BEST Undertaking after reading recorded by the new replaced meter, are available. Hence, submitted to direct the complainant to wait till the final action to be taken by the Respondent BEST Undertaking in his complaint.

- 9.0 In the aforesaid observation it is blatantly manifest that the instant complaint filed by the complainant has been *premature* one and he would be at liberty to resubmit his grievance, if any, after the final action taken by the Respondent BEST Undertaking in his instant complaint.

ORDER

1. The complaint no. N -F(N)-202-2013 stands dismissed being premature one.
2. Copies be given to both the parties.

(Shri S M Mohite)
Member

(Shri M P Thakkar)
Member

(Shri R U Ingule)
Chairman