

**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-102-2011.12
Complainant	Shri M A Kothi & Shri V R Shah on behalf of Kothi Steel Limited at village Chikhodra, Vejalpur Road, Tal: Godhra, Dist : Panchmahals.
Respondent	Shri R M Patel E E & Shri K R Desai, D E of Godhra MGVCL.
Date of hearing	23.12.2011

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 14.12.11 is for revised bill issued for the month of Nov-11, Consumer No.41031.

Today on 23.12.2011, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri M A Kothi & Shri V R Shah, appeared for M/s. Kothi Steel Limited, whereas Shri R M Patel, E E & Shri K R Desai, D E both from Godhra 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 connection of 17000 KVA Contract Demand at 66 KV at Chikhodra, Vejalpur Road, Dist:Panchmahals.
2. The power supply is under HTP-IV tariff.
3. Their production is in the night hours i.e. from 10.00 PM to 6.00 AM next morning.
4. Their energy bill for the month of Nov 2011 was for Rs.1,81,74,854.57 under HTP-IV tariff which was paid by complainant.
5. On 30.11.2011, a revised bill of Rs.2,59,50,080.74 was sent by MGVCL under HTP-I tariff due to violation of HTP-IV tariff.

The complainant contended that from MRI data, it is found that so called demand violation is not the power consumed by them. The apparent power had resulted in KVA demand. The demand had crossed the limit by only 130 KVA, it is less than 1%, this negligible increase cannot be controlled manually by inspection. In

addition to that they have not done production in day time and power under violation has not been used for purpose of production other than maintenance. Considering this point, the Forum was requested to cancel the amount asked by MGVCL under the clause of violation.

The Respondent contended that track record of the complainant is found good except there was minor violation of tariff application in the year 2006 and second is the present case. The revised bill was issued by applying HTP-I tariff under the pretext that demand restricted under HTP-IV tariff is violated by the complainant.

The Forum has studied the documents placed and the contention of the complainant and Respondent, the electronic MRI data (generated by MGVCL meters installed at complainant's premises and submitted to Forum for perusal).

On detailed study of the MRI data, it is seen in TOD MD Registers that the KVA MD value exceeds on 18.11.2011 at 20.00 hours. The value of the KVA MD is 13.4 x 200 MF i.e. 2680 KVA against the allowed 15% of 17000 KVA Contract Demand as per GERC Tariff Order dated 6.9.2011 (effective from 1.9.2011), clause No.16, Note No.1. As per the HTP-IV tariff, Petitioner can use 10% of total units consumed and 15% of the Contract Demand beyond the prescribed hours as per HTP-IV tariff for the purpose of the maintenance. The prescribed limits are 10.00 PM to 6.00 AM next morning. Accordingly, the KVA demand shall not exceed 15% of 17000 KVA i.e. 2550 KVA and the total units consumption shall not be exceed 10% of 1,36,000 i.e. 13600 KWH. The limit of units consumption is not crossed but the 15% limit of KVA Contract Demand is crossed on the day under reference.

From the load graph in the MRI of the HT TVM provided at complainant's end, it is seen that the KVA demand has exceeded the value 2550 KVA on 18.11.2011 at 20.00 hours in half hour's block which value shows as 2680 KVA. Thus, complainant has violated the tariff conditions. The Respondent has served the bill as per HTP-I tariff for the month of November 2011 and it is in order as per note 5 of clause 16.0 Rate HTP-IV of Tariff Schedule for consumers. From the MRI data, it can be seen that there is exceed of Contract Demand i.e. 130 KVA.

ORDER

The Forum does not find any merit is considered the grievance of the complainant M/s. Kothi Steel Limited and the bill issued by the MGVCL is considered in order and eligible to recover accordingly.

(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>