

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)-245-2014 dtd. 15/01/2015.

Mr. Satvinder S. KakarComplainant

V/S

B.E.S.&T. UndertakingRespondent

Present

Chairman

Quorum : Shri V. G. Indrale, Chairman

Member

1. Shri S.S. Bansode, Member
2. Shri S.M. Mohite , Member

On behalf of the Complainant : 1. Mr. Sunil H. Pawar

On behalf of the Respondent : 1. Shri M. M. Bhonsle, DECC(F/N)
2. Smt. T.Y. Rege, AAO-3 CC(F/N)

Date of Hearing : 12/02/2015

Date of Order : 18/02/2015

Judgment by Shri. Vinayak G. Indrale, Chairman

Shri Satvinder S. Kakar, 64, 6th floor, 9/C-1, Karmakshetra, CAM Harbanslal Road, GTB Nagar, Sion Koliwada, Antop Hill, Mumbai - 400 037 has come before the Forum for high Bill complaint pertaining to A/c no.655-065-053.

Complainant has submitted in brief as under :

1.0 The complainant has approached to IGR Cell on 03/11/2014 for high Bill complaint pertaining to A/c no. 655-065-053. The complainant has approached to CGRF in schedule 'A' dtd. 09/01/2015 (received by CGRF on 13/01/2015) as he was not satisfied by the remedy provided by the IGR Cell Distribution Licensee regarding his grievance.

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

- 2.0 Electric supply has been given to the complainant Shri Satvinder S. Kakar through meter no. L941845 for residential purpose having A/c.No.655-065-053. In the month of January 2012 meter no. L941845 found slow and stopped working, hence this meter was replaced by meter no.N103595.
- 3.0 After replacement, the consumption brought by meter reader on Meter No.N10395 of 6346 and 4827 units did not match with past consumption pattern, hence a complaint was again registered on 17-7-2012 for investigation of high consumption. On inspection of meter No.N103595 it was found that same meter is within permissible limits of accuracy. Hence, after informing the consumer, he was charged 12024 reading and 9305 units in January, 2013 electricity bill.
- 4.0 The complainant has registered high bill complaint vide KLG 1713794 dtd. 10/03/2014. The complainant's meter no. N103595 is tested on site on 12/04/2014 and found working within permissible limits of accuracy.
- 5.0 Necessary debit/credit was carried out. Amendment for the earlier defective meter no. L941845 resulting in net debit of Rs. 19,810.45 was carried out for the period of 3 months from 20-10-2011 to 20-1-2012. The consumer was also given necessary slab benefit for the period from 20-1-2012 to 9-1-2013. Further delayed payment charges of Rs. 2,569.68 for the period from February, 2013 to June, 2013 and penalty interest charges of Rs. 3,226.20 for the period from March,2013 to June, 2013 were refunded. The same is reflected in in October, 2014 bill.
- 6.0 The complainant's meter no. N103595 was again tested after filing complaint in Annexure 'C' vide KLG 2078980 dtd. 07/01/2015 and found working within permissible limits of accuracy.
- 7.0 The consumer's earlier meter No. L941845 was found slow and was replaced by meter No. N103595, which consumer is disputing again and again. It is quite possible that the earlier meter no. L941845 had become slow before ultimately becoming stopped in January 2012 and therefore consumer feels that the new meter is fast. Consumer is having a three phase meter and the connected load too is 8.92 kW.
- 8.0 The consumer is deliberately pursuing his contention that the meter is fast and insisting to replace this meter though the meter is tested thrice on site and finding out to be within limits of accuracy. The consumer is very irregular in paying electricity bills as per our payment history.
- 9.0 The consumer has been informed that his meter no. N103595 can be tested in our laboratory on making necessary payment of testing charges. The consumer may be asked to pay the electricity bill of Rs.2,00,600/- as on January, 2015.

REASONS

- 10.0 We have heard Mr. Satvinder Kakar in person and Mr. Pawar representative of the complainant and for the Respondent BEST Undertaking Shri M.M. Bhonsle, DECC(F/N) and Smt. T.Y. Rege, AAOCC(F/N). Perused documents placed before us.
- 11.0 The main contention of the complainant is that the electronic meter which was replaced and installed is showing high reading than that of previous old meter. It is the contention that the complainant himself has brought to the notice of the Respondent BEST Undertaking that earlier his meter was showing less reading and inspite of this the Respondent BEST Undertaking is not looking after his grievance of recording high reading by the new installed electronic meter. The representative of the complainant has vehemently submitted that it is obligatory on the part of the Respondent BEST Undertaking to place check meter to know whether the new electronic meter is showing correct reading or not. In counter to this the Respondent BEST Undertaking brought to the notice of the Forum that previously there was practice for placing the check meter in case of old meters but at present there is no such procedure for electronic meter to affix check meter. Further the Respondent BEST Undertaking informed this Forum that considering the applied load to the consumer's residence, in any case it could not be held that the electronic meter affixed is showing incorrect or high reading, as the meter was tested with the help of standard meter testing equipment i.e. accu-check machine at site and found **NO ERROR** in the accuracy. The average error was only 0.1% error and is within the permissible limit of accuracy.
- 12.0 The Respondent BEST Undertaking has placed before this Forum written statement on record two site testing reports to show that the installed meter is showing accurate reading as per the actual consumption of electricity. The representative of the complainant has submitted that site testing report dtd. 12/04/2014 does not reflect accuracy check testing on minimum load and therefore the said report is not correct. In response to this the Respondent BEST Undertaking brought to the notice of the Forum that as the complaint was of high bill, it is not at all necessary to see the accuracy of meter on minimum load. This submission of the Respondent BEST Undertaking appears to be logical. It appears that again on 27/01/2015 meter was tested on site and same average of 0.1% error was shown and in this test report also testing on minimum load was not done. Considering 2 site testing reports, the Respondent BEST Undertaking submitted that there is no fault in the newly replaced and installed electronic meter and informed this Forum that the consumer is only making grievance of high bill because of his reading shown in previous old meter is less. In site testing report connected load is shown and it appears that the consumer has affixed equipments like air-conditioner, tube-lights, fans, oven etc. and considering the total wattage, it appears that new meter is showing proper reading. During the hearing the complainant informed to this Forum that being electronic meter, it might be jumped and showing high electricity consumption. In response to this the Respondent BEST Undertaking brought to the notice of this Forum that the

consumption pattern of the complainant is consistent and as per the electricity consumed during the period i.e. seasonal variation, there is no such hike recorded and the contention of the complainant is wrong and baseless. This Forum also observed from the Ledger of consumption pattern of the complainant and found that the consumption pattern of the complainant is consistent and there is no such jump or hike as per the complainant.

- 13.0 The representative of the complainant has submitted that electronic meter which has been placed is of EMCO make which is faulty and there are several complaints of consumers and there is ban of installing such meters. However, the representative of the complainant could not place any such documents on record to prove his contention. The Respondent BEST Undertaking has submitted that if the complainant has grievance regarding high bill, he has every right to approach for BEST's meter testing lab or IDEMI test (Govt. lab) on payment of requisite charges and for that the complainant is not ready. We do not find any hitch for the complainant to adopt the above said two tests to remove any doubt in his mind regarding high recording units in the meter.
- 14.0 The Forum has gone through the Leger Folio regarding the electricity consumption of the meter and after perusal of the same it appears that there is average bill units for every month except for the month of January 2013. It is because, the meter was not recording the correct units for earlier two months i.e. before January 2013. The representative of the complainant has submitted that meter was replaced without the knowledge of the consumer. The Forum does not find any merit in this contention as at the insistence of consumer only the old meter was replaced and new meter was affixed.
- 15.0 Having regards to the above said reasons and considering the documents placed on record by the Respondent BEST Undertaking i.e. two site testing reports it appears that the unit recorded by the meter are accurate as in site testing report only 0.1% permissible error is shown. The Forum again observes that it is for the consumer to apply for lab test or IDEMI on payment of requisite charges and in that case the Respondent BEST Undertaking should co-operate the consumer and remove the doubt of high recording of units from the consumer's mind by replacing the meter. Thus the Forum do not find any merit in the grievance of the consumer for high bill, therefore the complaint deserves to be dismissed.

ORDER

1. The complaint No. N-F(N))-245-2014 dtd. 15/01/2015 stands dismissed.
2. Copies of this order be given to both the parties.

(Shri S.M. Mohite)
Member

(Shri S.S. Bansode)
Member

(Shri V.G. Indrate)
Chairman