

**BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
MADHYA GUJARAT VIJ COLIMITED
CORPORATE OFFICE, 5TH FLOOR SP VIDYUT BHAVAN,
RACECOURSE, VADODARA 390 007**

Subject	Consumer Grievances Complaint No.MG-I-23-2015.16
Complainant	Mr. V.R. Kapoor, representative of M/s Yogi Quarry Works, At Udalpur, Ta. Savli, Dist. Vadodara
Respondent	Shri S.L. Varma, Executive Engineer (O&M), MGCVL, Division Office, Godhra
Date of hearing	3-7-2015, at Godhra

QUORUM	NAME
Chairperson	Shri P J Patel, Gandhinagar
Independent Member	Harsha S Chauhan, Vadodara
Technical Member	Shri A G Shah, MGVCL

The complaint dated 18.06.2015 regarding issue of wrong estimate for 11 KV, 200 KVA connection.

On 3/7/2015, Shri V.R. Kapoor, representative of complainant from M/s. Yogi Quarry Works whereas Shri S.L. Varma, Executive Engineer (O&M) MGVCL Division Office Godhra as respondent were present during hearing. Both parties were heard.

The brief details of the case are as under:

1. At present the connection is running 100 KW LTMD connection under Kakanpur s/D at village Kakanpur.
2. Complainant is in need of extension of load from 100 KW = 134 KVA to 200 KVA, Registration charge should be charged Rs. 660/- instead of Rs. 2000/-.
3. S.E. (O&M) Godhra has issued estimate vide letter No. GDC/T-4/HT/NEW/YOGI Quarry/ 3313 dated 25/5/2015.
4. Sr.No.1, existing D.P. Structure can be converted into CTPT unit. The extra cost shown should be cancelled Rs. 81552/-.
5. Some circles of MGVCL are charging 8RMT whereas Godhra circle is charging 9RMT. Why discrepancy in one MGVCL company in two different circle ?
6. The amount Rs. 1,19,396/- should be deleted from estimate, as it is not applicable as per Supply Code.
7. Existing transformer's depreciation cost should be refunded.
8. The GETCO charge should be for 66 KVA instead of 200 KVA.

The representative of complainant contended that in addition to his complaint, the cost of CTPT structure can be deleted by utilizing structure of existing PSC mounted transformer. Extra burden for the cost of new LT transformer required for other consumers should not be applicable to them. Security deposit already paid while taking LT connection should be adjusted while recovery of new Security Deposit for HT connection. Fencing structure required for the protection around the CTPT should be at the cost of MGVCL.

The respondent contended that -

1. The estimate issued for conversion of LT to HT consumer, the cost of connected infrastructure is taken as per the latest cost data. For HT line, it is a practice to install line on RSJ pole so existing RSJ Pole DP structure cannot be utilized.
2. CTPT structure protection at ground level is being done with FRP fencing by MGVCL. The cost estimated at running meter rate are as per the cost data and approximately 9 metres will be required. However, actual cost after installation will be considered in HT final bill.
3. Registration charges are applicable as per the GERC notification No.9 of 2005 para 8.1 (A) Sr.No. (VI), as LT connection to be made PDC and new HT connection to be given.
4. There is existing 5 HP water works connection from the transformer in the premises of M/s Yogi Quarry Works. This consumer is required to shift by installing separate transformer hence as per the existing practice, the cost of LT transformer required for water works has to be recovered from M/s. Yogi Quarry Works.
5. The labour charges for dismantling line and structure are estimated as per existing rules.
6. The existing line and transformer is the property of MGVCL as FQ charges were recovered at the time of releasing of LT connection. Therefore, its depreciation cost is not refundable.
7. For HT connection, GETCO pro-rata charges are applicable which is not in the estimate of LT connection.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and observed that the estimated charges except installation of new 10 KVA transformer for existing water works connection are as per rules. At the time of issue of FQ for the water works connection, the pro-rata charges must have been recovered at that time. The spare capacity in the transformer installed at the location of M/s Yogi Quarry Works is utilized to give LT supply to the water works. Hence it is the economical way to use the infrastructure available near the water work. Now due to conversion from LT to HT for M/s Yogi Quarry Works, it is the duty of MGVCL to continue power supply to the water works without recovery of cost either from M/s Yogi Quarry Works or the water works.

Therefore, the estimate charged for installation of 10 KVA new transformer for the water works is required to revise and should be deleted from the estimate issued to M/s Yogi Quarry Works. Except point no.4 as above of the respondent, the Forum agreed for the contention.

ORDER

The Forum directs the Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited to revise the estimate issued to M/s Yogi Quarry Works by reviewing the charges related to the existing water works connection.

(A G Shah)
Technical Member

(Harsha S Chauhan)
Independent Member

(P J Patel)
Chairperson

PS :

If the complainant is not satisfied with the order of this Forum, the complainant may approach The Staff Officer, Office of the Electricity Ombudsman, Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, Barrack No.3, Polytechnic Compound, Ambawadi, Ahmedabad 380 015 in accordance with Clause No.2.63 Chapter-2 of GERC Notification No.2 of 2011.

Procedure to make representations before Ombudsman***

1. Representation should be in writing duly signed by the complainant with his name and address.
2. Representation should be supported with affidavit.
3. True copy of order of Forum and original complaint made before Forum should be attached. Enclosed documents should be certified copies of the original documents.
4. The representation before Ombudsman should be submitted within 30 days from the date of order of Forum.
5. Copy of representation should be submitted at the office of Ombudsman. Copy of representation should be submitted to all respondents.
6. If the complainant is required to pay any amount according to the order of Forum, one-third of such amount should be deposited by complainant and proofs should be attached along with the representation.
7. The matter should not be pending before the competent Forum or any other court, tribunal, arbitrator or any other authority.
8. All representations should be with a sufficient cause, reasonable diligence causing the consumer prima facie loss and damages / inconvenience.
9. Representation may be submitted in English or Gujarati language

*** <http://www.gercin.org/docs/Cosumer%20Grievances/Procedure/Procedure.pdf>