

BEFORE THE CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
C/o MADHYA GUJARAT VIJ CO LIMITED
CORPORATE OFFICE, 2ND FLOOR SP VIDYUT BHAVAN,
RACECOURSE, VADODARA 390 007

Subject	Consumer Grievances Complaint No.MG-II-34-09.10
Complainant	Shri Hari Ashram, Haridham, Sokhada Vadodara, con No.02102/02133/5
Respondent	Shri N V Vaidya, EE Vadodara (Rural) and Shri V S Chavda, DE Chhani S/dn of MGVCL.
Date of hearing	26/10/2009

QUORUM	NAME
Chairman	Shri S A Pota, MGVCL
Member	Shri K R Shah, MGVCL
Independent Member	Dr R C Desai, Vadodara
Convener	Shri P L Mistry, MGVCL

This complaint dated 27.8.2008 is directed against the alleged non-action for augmentation of electrical installation inspite of payment of Rs.65884/- on 6.7.2006 vide MR No.CK-973462.

Today on 26.10.09, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri Sadhu Gyanswaroop, appeared on behalf of Shri Hari Ashram, whereas Shri N V Vaidya, EE and Shri V S Chavda DE appeared as respondents on behalf of MGVCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The facts of the case are as follows. The well known Hari Ashram Sokhada is having several connections under various constituents- Hari Ashram, Yogi Mahila Kendra, Yogi Divine society etc since eighties. They had then paid Security Deposit while availing various connections. However, Contract Demand was increased from time to time and as such, the MGVCL as per latest rules in force sought additional Security Deposit of Rs.65884/- in 2006 and was paid by the complainant Shri Hari Ashram on 6.7.2006 vide MR No.CK-973462. The complainant felt that this amount was collected by MGVCL towards augmentation of electrical system including enhancing capacity of transformer. They have, therefore, complained that inspite of paying the aforesaid amount, the transformer capacity is not yet raised. Being aggrieved by lack of response from MGVCL, they have approached this Forum by a letter dated 27.8.09.

The representative of the complainant contended that they are having a Contract Demand of [90 + 90] KVA under LFD-III category and 75 HP for industrial connection whereas the capacity of transformer from which this load is supplied is of 200 KVA. Therefore, the transformer capacity is required to be raised to atleast 250 KVA. In spite of repeated requests and reminders, the transformer capacity is not yet raised after the payment of amount of Rs.65884/-. They have installed many Geysers and Air-conditioners later but they have to restrict their usage under the fear that if these appliances are used, the load may exceed beyond transformer capacity and it may burst causing loss to property and life and also suffering of inmates due to disruption of electric supply. Therefore, they sought remedy to this inconvenient situation.

The Respondent Shri N V Vaidya EE of MGVCL contended that the amount of Rs.65884/- sought by MGVCL and paid by the complainant is towards the additional Security Deposit towards the enhancement of Contract Demand from time to time in the past. It is not at all collected for augmentation of electrical system. It is true that the total Contract Demand of $90 + 90 + 75 \text{ KVA} = 255 \text{ KVA}$ exceeds 200 KVA capacity of transformer. However, during load survey and monitoring of consumption, they found that actual consumption did not exceed 100 KVA load. However, to satisfy the complainant, they are ready to conduct afresh load survey of actual connected load of lighting, fans, TVs, geysers, Air-conditioners etc and estimate the consumption considering Diversity Factor. If they find that with all these appliances in use at a time if the actual consumption exceeds 200 KVA, they would raise the transformer capacity.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records. They felt that the Security Deposit amount collected is in order as per rules in force and is misconceived by the complainant as the charges towards augmentation of electrical system. It is the responsibility of MGVCL to raise the transformer capacity but they did not find it necessary considering the actual load of consumption less than transformer capacity. However, to satisfy the complainant, it is desired that a fresh load survey of actual connected load, including recently connected appliances like geysers, Air-conditioners etc be conducted and considering diversity factor, if the actual consumption is likely to exceed transformer capacity, it may be replaced as agreed upon by MGVCL and also the complainant. However, care may be taken by the complainant to ensure that the connected load does not exceed the contract load on each connection to avoid violation of other rules.

In view of the above discussion, the Forum is of the opinion that the amount of Rs.65884/- collected towards additional Security Deposit by MGVCL is in order and the transformer capacity should be raised if found necessary by MGVCL after fresh load survey is undertaken.

ORDER

The Forum opines that Rs.65884/- collected by MGVCL from the complainant as Security Deposit is in order and directs the Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited to conduct afresh load survey of the complainant's installation and the transformer capacity be raised, if found necessary by MGVCL.

(K R Shah)
Member

(Dr R C Desai)
Independent Member

(S A Pota)
Chairman

PS :

If the complainant is not satisfied with the order of this Forum, the complainant may approach the Ombudsman, Gujarat Electricity Regulatory Commission, 1st floor, Neptune Tower, OPP: Nehru Bridge, Ashram Road, Ahmedabad 380 009 in accordance with Chapter-5, Clause No.13 of GERC Notification No.4 of 2005.