

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

Subject	Consumer Grievances Complaint No.MG-III-81-2012-13
Complainant	Mohammad Habib Faridkhan Pathan at 78, Aatifnagar, Tandalja, Vasna Road, Vadodara.
Respondent	Shri C.D. Valvai, DE, Vasana S/dn
Date of hearing	14.12.2012 at Corporate Office, MGVCL Vadodara

QUORUM	NAME
Chairperson	Shri P J Patel, Gandhinagar
Independent Member	Shri M J Vaidya, Vadodara
Technical Member	Shri Y B Sukhadia, MGVCL

The complaint dated 4.12.12 regarding dispute of residence meter and high energy bill.

On 14.12.2012, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Mohammad Habib Faridkhan Pathan, appeared himself whereas Shri C.D. Valvai appeared as respondent on behalf of MGVCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The brief details of the case are:

1. The complainant has consumer No. 15703/01376/3 and Meter No. MGVC240023.
2. Meter reading dispute and high energy bill even though the connected load is less and less use of electricity.

The consumer contended that for every bill since last 6 months he has to go to MGVCL office to resolve meter disputes like faulty meter, height of meter, meter checking etc. but reported no improvement till Oct-Nov'12 months billing. Even very limited connected load, bill amount of Rs 1324.00 is high. Average unit consumption given in for the month of Oct-Nov'12 is high compared to their normal consumption. The meter was faulty and replaced by MGVCL.

The respondent contended that upon complaint of high consumption, meter was replaced on 13/07/2012 and got tested in meter testing laboratory where it was reported no defect in the meter. Meter again replaced on 12/12/2012 due to display problem and its last reading not readable and could not be downloaded in MRI. He reported that due to faulty meter, the average consumption of 250 Units was considered by the meter reader.

The forum members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and noted the billing record as under:

As per Bills issued:

MONTH	Meter Reading	UNITS
Feb-Mar-12	98	69
Apr-May-12	607	509
Jun-Jul-12	737	130 (Meter replaced on 13 th Jul, Last reading = 673)
Aug-Sep-12	113	376
Oct-Nov-12	113	250(Avg-Faulty meter)

Old meter replaced on 13/07/2012 and its last reading as per data sheet and also confirmed by the Meter Testing Laboratory, was 673 Units. The meter reader has taken reading in next billing cycle of Jun-Jul'12 as 737 which is wrong as old meter replaced on 13th July having last reading 673 units. The meter reader has also not considered new meter reading which was in place while taking that reading. Hence 737 minus 673 equal to 64 units credit should be given to the consumer. (Revise the bill of Jun-Jul'12 for 673-607=66 units)

The meter change entry was not considered in next billing cycle hence meter reader had made mistake while billing of Aug-Sep'12 where past-reading 737 units and current-reading 113 units entered (initial reading of new meter = 01) for which the computer has considered 1113 units to subtract 737 units and billed for 1113-737 = 376 which is also wrong. These wrong billings have further reflected in calculation of average bill during meter faulty status i.e. for the month of Oct-Nov'12 wherein 250 units average considered. Meter reading for Aug-Sep'12 done on 01/10/2012 for 113 units is a consumption from 13/07/2012 to 1/10/2012 i.e. consumption is 113-01=112 units so bill of Aug-Sep'12 also requires to revise.

It is also noticed based on MRI of old meter that the meter reader had not taken correct reading in respective months in past so cumulative units reflects when correct reading was taken.

Again meter replaced on 12/12/2012 due to display failure. Considering bi-monthly billing and to consider probable period of failure, respondent was asked to submit MRI data of the meter. The respondent has submitted same on 14/12/2012 as under.

As per Meter Reading Instrument (MRI):

Date	Recorded Units	Difference(Units)
13/07/2012	01	- (New Meter's initial reading)
01/08/2012	31	30
01/09/2012	75	44
01/10/2012	113	38
01/11/2012	141	28
01/12/2012	154	13 (Faulty meter)
12/12/2012	154	0 (Faulty meter replaced)

From the above, it seems that the meter had stopped working in November 2012. The meter has stopped recording after 154 units. While billing for the month of Oct-Nov'12, average bill for 250 units considered by meter reader based on the wrong past entry is high, it needs to revise.

In view of the above discussion, the Forum is of the opinion that there is a mistake on the part of meter reader and billing/computer error. All bills from Jun-Jul'12 to Oct-Nov'12 required to revise based on factual data as above.

ORDER

The Forum directs the Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited to revise all bills issued for the month of Jun-Jul 2012, Aug-Sep 2012 and Oct-Nov 2012 and refund / adjust the excess amount paid by the consumer and also see that same nature of mistake should not be repeated in next billing cycle. The Forum also directs the MGVCL to submit copy of the revised bill with calculation to the Forum.

(Y B Sukhadia)
Technical Member

(M J Vaidya)
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 Chapter-5, Clause No.13 of GERC Notification No.4 of 2005.

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>