

**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-FN-278-2015 dtd. 29/12/2015.**

Shri Ashok Mehta .....Complainant

V/S

B.E.S.&T. Undertaking .....Respondent

**Present**

Chairman

Quorum : Shri V. G. Indrale, Chairman

Member

1. Shri S.Y. Gaikwad, Member
2. Shri S.M. Mohite, Member CPO

On behalf of the Complainant : 1. Shri Ashok Mehta

On behalf of the Respondent : 1. Shri Santosh Sonawane, Supdt. CC(F/N)  
2. Shri D.K. Lambate, AAM CC(F/N)  
3. Smt. T.Y. Rege, AAO3

Date of Hearing : 25/02/2016

Date of Order : 29/02/2016

**Judgment by Shri. Vinayak G. Indrale, Chairman**

Shri Ashok P. Mehta, 226/227, Lakshman Nivas, Near GTB Nagar Railway Station, Sion (East), Mumbai - 400 022 has come before the Forum for complaint regarding High bill complaint and grievance regarding debit / credit carried out pertaining to A/c no. 659-769-031\*0.

**Complainant has submitted in brief as under :**

The complainant has approached to IGR Cell on 27/10/2015 with his dispute about high bill raised in the month of October 2013 for the period from June 2011 to October 2013 pertaining to A/c no. 756-286-013\*2.. The complainant has approached to CGRF in schedule 'A' dtd. 22/12/2015 (received by CGRF on 22/12/2015) as he was not satisfied by the remedy provided by the IGR Cell of Distribution Licensee regarding his grievance.

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

- 2.0 Shri Ashok Mehta has come before the Forum regarding his grievance about high bill in the month Oct 2012 raised due to charging 1134 units recorded by the meter number D118067 and 8905 units charged as recorded by the meter number E053733 in the month Oct 2013.
- 3.0 Shri Ashok Pritamlal Mehta had two meter Nos. **C098314** and **G865945** installed at his premises under consumer No.659-769-031. The Meter No.**G865945** was replaced by meter No.**E053733** in May 2011. Inadvertently this meter number **E053733** remained to be updated for billing purpose. The meter reader had brought the readings up 23/03/2011 and complainant was billed accordingly till 23-3-2011. After that with the introduction of Ramcram machine, the meter reader could not get the reading on the Ramcram machine as new meter was not updated in the system. The meter reader has recorded the readings of the meter as 8905 on 17/10/2013 and accordingly the consumer was billed in billing month Oct 2013.
- 4.0 Similarly meter number **C098314** was replaced by meter number **D118067** on **06/08/2012**. After that the complainant was billed for 1134 units recorded by meter number **D118067** in Oct 2012.
- 5.0 Necessary debit / credit was carried out by giving slab benefit resulting in net credit of Rs 73,000.43 and refunding Delay Payment & penalty interest for the period Nov 2012 to June 2014 amounting to Rs 14,104.48 . The same is reflected in bill month for Sept 2014.
- 6.0 Also, delay payment charges amounting to Rs. 133.09 and penalty interest amounting to Rs. 6965.88 for the period July 2014 to December 2014 was refunded through electricity bill for the month February 2015.
- 7.0 The same meter No.E053733 is removed on 28-10-2015 for the reason combination of meter. Till the date of removal the said meter was working and showing proper consumption.

**REASONS**

- 8.0 We have heard the arguments of the complainant in person and for the Respondent BEST Undertaking Shri Santosh Sonawane, Supdt. CC(F/N), Shri D.K. Lambate, AAM CC(F/N) and Smt. T.Y. Rege, AAO3 . Perused the documents annexed by the complainant along with Schedule 'A' and written statement filed by the Respondent BEST Undertaking along with documents marked at Exhibit 'A' to 'D'.

- 9.0 The complainant has vehemently submitted that since the year 1968 there are two meters affixed to his premises and the average bill of both the meters never exceeds 150-160 units. He has further submitted that he has not installed air-conditioner to his premises and therefore average bill carved out by the Respondent BEST Undertaking for meter no. E053733 as 297 units is very high and not proper. We have gone through the record more particularly documents filed by the complainant and he has shown the chart of consumption of electricity by both the meters and it is in between 120-70 units.
- 10.0 The complainant had grievance about charging of bill for 1134 units as shown consumed by electric meter no. D118067. The Respondent BEST Undertaking in written statement has submitted that they have prepared dr/cr note by giving slab benefit as shown at pg. 19 and 21 and issued the correct bill. The complainant has satisfied about the said dr/cr note and now he has no grievance about the bill charged for 1134 units.
- 11.0 Now the next grievance of the complainant is in respect of carving out the average consumption of 297 units per month due to upgrading the meter after 30 months. It is pertinent to note that the meter was replaced in the month of May 2011 and the Respondent BEST Undertaking has updated the said meter in the month of October 2013. This is not proper on the part of the employee of the BEST Undertaking as they must be prompt in updating the meter with a view to protect the interest of BEST Undertaking.
- 12.0 We have cautiously gone through the Meter Reading Folio filed by the Respondent BEST Undertaking and it appears that the average monthly units consumed by both the meters never exceeded 200 units. So in view of this aspect we have asked the Respondent BEST Undertaking's representative as to how and on what basis they have carved out the average monthly units of 297 for the period of 30 months. We have asked the Respondent BEST Undertaking's representative as to why they have not placed on record Meter Removal Advice Slip to know the initial readings of the meter no. E053733 when it was installed. The Respondent BEST Undertaking has poorly explained that the meter was conventional and therefore it can be presumed that initial reading was zero. In the absence of any Meter Removal Advice Slip, the above said submission of the Respondent BEST Undertaking cannot be accepted. It appears that the meter no. E053733 installed at that time electricity must have consumed by the said meter. We felt so because RAMCRAM meter reading placed on record by the Respondent BEST Undertaking at the time of argument. For the purpose of identification we have marked it as Exhibit 'E'. After perusal of the same it appears that units consumed by the said meter in the month of August 2011 is shown as 6227 units. It means for earlier period i.e. July, June, May the electricity consumed by the said meter is 6227 units. This appears to be highly improbable that in the period of 3 months, the complainant has consumed units of 6227 by electric meter no. E053733. We have carved out the average consumption of units by meter no. E053733 on the basis of RAMCRAM meter reading Exhibit 'E' for the period August 2011 to September 2013 i.e. for 25 months ( $8826 - 6227 = 2599$ ) and average monthly consumption comes to 104 units per month for 30 months i.e. for the period of May 2011 to September

2013. We have perused Meter Reading Folio after upgrading the meter wherein units consumed for every month is in between 91 to 97 for the period from December 2013 to October 2015. This shows that there was no defect in the meter.

- 13.0 For the above said reasons and in the absence of Meter Removal Advice Slip for recording the initial units of installed meter we have found substance in the grievance of the complainant that without any record the Respondent BEST Undertaking has carved out average bill of 297 units and charged the bill for 8905 units. We have already observed that from the reading recorded by RAMCRAM meter reading, the average consumption of the complainant per month comes to 104 units. Thus, the complainant is liable to pay electricity charges for  $104 \times 30 = 3120$  units. We have perused the record and it appears that the complainant has been charged the electricity charges for 8905 units and thereafter gave the slab benefit and gave the credit after preparing dr/cr note. We have discussed that the Respondent BEST Undertaking has not properly carved out the average units in which period they have not updated the meter. We have calculated the readings recorded by RAMCRAM Exhibit 'E' and the average monthly consumption comes to 104 units. Thus total units consumed for 30 months comes to 3120 units. The complainant is only liable to pay electricity charges for the units of 3120 and not units of 8905 as charged by the Respondent BEST Undertaking.
- 14.0 As the BEST Undertaking sought time for filing say as well as the complainant vide letter dated 02/02/2016 sought extension time for hearing as he was out of station . Therefore there is delay in passing the order.
- 15.0 For the above said reasons we have arrived at the conclusion that the Respondent BEST Undertaking has incorrectly carved out 297 consumption of units per month for the period May 2011 to September 2013 in which meter was not updated. Thus we find substance in the complaint of the complainant. In result we pass the following order.

#### ORDER

1. The complaint No. N-FN-278-2015 dtd. 29/12/2015 stands partly allowed.
2. The Respondent BEST Undertaking is directed to charge average bill of 104 units per month for the period from May 2011 to September 2013 and issue revise bill accordingly.
3. If the amount deposited by the complainant is found excess, the said amount will be adjusted in ensuing monthly electricity bill of the complainant.
4. The Respondent BEST Undertaking is directed to comply the order within one month from the date of receipt of the order.
5. Copies of this order be given to both the parties.

(Shri S.Y. Gaikwad)  
Member

(Shri S.M. Mohite)  
Member

(Shri V.G. Indrale)  
Chairman