

**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-67-2012.13
Complainant	Shri Dipak D Advani of Shankar Ice Factory at Bhuravav, Godhra.
Respondent	Shri T C Vyas, Deputy Engineer Godhra Rural s/dn of MGVCL.
Date of hearing	02.11.2012 at Godhra.

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 4.10.12 regarding wrong amount of arrears in energy bill.

On 02.11.2012, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri Dipak A Advani appeared himself on behalf of M/s. Shankar Ice Factory whereas Shri T C Vyas, Deputy Engineer Godhra Rural s/dn appeared as respondent on behalf of MGVCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The complainant has contended as under:

1. The complainant has consumer No.17701 / 51012 / 5
2. During July 2010, in energy bill, arrears was shown Rs.265665.84
3. From May 2001, billing for reactive units was started and closing reading of reactive reading was recorded as 156404.
4. At the billing time, the meter reader had missed to record the current meter reading of reactive units. Subsequently, reactive units bill of Rs.91132.01 was issued on the basis of meter reading, 156404 to 46404 and 890000 reactive units. This was shown as arrears in the next bill.

5. During June 2001, reactive units reading was corrected as 162244 - 156404 = 5840 reactive units and calculation was revised.
6. Similarly, during Sept 2003, reading was recorded as 184529 and bill of Rs.90596/ was prepared of 815471 reactive units considering present meter reading 000 and hence there was no reactive units bill during September 2003. The necessary correction was made in the billing months for reactive units by sub-division and surplus payment done was credited to the complainant.
7. During Nov-2004, it was off season period and there was no energy consumption but the bill for 11620 was issued as average bill.
8. After representation of the complainant, meter was immediately replaced and for the month October 2004, the bill was issued for 1840 units amounting to Rs.10438/- for 20 days. For November 2004, the average was worked out 6320 units and accordingly bill was revised for 6320 units amounting to Rs.28975/-. Accordingly, the credit was given for Rs.57601.83.
9. Similarly, during Nov 2008, the consumption was recorded as 000 units and reactive units was considered as 266000, MGVCL has issued additional bill of Rs.26600/-. This was also cancelled after checking records.
10. During above four cases, the credit given is not correct and MGVCL showed the arrears of Rs.265665.84 in the bill.

The respondent contended that:

1. Consumer No.17701/51012 /5 in name of Shri Dipak D Advani, C/o Shankar Ice Factory, having 60 HP load, billing for reactive units was started in May 2001 billed in June 2001 and closing reading of reactive reading was recorded as 146404.
2. At the billing time, the meter reader had recorded the wrong meter reading of reactive units for May 2001 billed in June 2001. Instead of 156404 units,

meter reader had recorded 46404 units. However, reactive units' bill of Rs.91132.01 was issued on the basis of meter reading of 890000 reactive units. It was considered as cycle of the meter as over and calculated as $1000000 - 156404 + 46404 = 890000$ reactive units. This was reading shown as arrears in the next bill.

3. During June 2001, billed in July 2001, reactive units reading was corrected as $162244 - 156404 = 5840$ reactive units and calculation was revised.
4. Similarly, during Sept 2003, reactive units reading was recorded as 00000 units and bill of Rs.90596/- was prepared of 815471 reactive units again considering past reading as 184529 and present reading as 00000 and issued bill for reactive unit as difference of 1000000 and 184529 i.e. 815471 meter reading and hence there was no reactive units bill during Sept 2003. The necessary correction was made in the billing months for reactive units by sub-division and surplus payment done was credited to the complainant.
5. During Nov-2004, the meter was faulty and the bill for 11620 was issued as average bill for KWH consumption.
6. After representation of the complainant, meter was immediately replaced and for the month October 2004, the bill was issued for 1840 units amounting to Rs.10438/- for 20 days. For November 2004, the average was worked out 6320 units and accordingly bill was revised for 6320 units amounting to Rs.28975/-. Accordingly, the credit was given for Rs.57601.83.
7. Similarly, during Nov 2008, the consumption was recorded as 000 units and reactive units was considered as 266000, MGVCL has issued additional bill of Rs.26600/-. This was also cancelled after checking records.
8. In all above four cases, credit given is correct and MGVCL showed the arrears of Rs.2,65,665.84 in the bill is to be withdrawn.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and observed that there was a punching error in May 2001 and Sept 2003 and Nov 2008, there was wrong punching of reactive

energy, hence, the credit was given by the MGVCL to the complainant Shri Dipak D Advani of Shankar Ice Factory at Bhuravav, Godhra, con No.17701 / 51012 / 5. This was also approved by Circle Office vide letter No.GDC/Accts/Rev/3728 dated 6.4.2013. However, Forum noticed that the credit given for wrong calculation of average bill during Nov 2004 is not justified. While going through consumption of previous year same month i.e. Nov 2003, it is observed that consumption was 13235 units. Hence, complainant contention that there was off season during Nov 2004 is not correct. Hence, the average consumption considered by computer of 11620 units is in order. Also, credit given for Dec 2004 considering off season is in order.

In view of the above discussion, the Forum is of the opinion that the MGVCL should revise the bills as per rules.

ORDER

The Forum directs the Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited that the bills revised for the month of May 2001, Sept 2003, November 2004 and November 2008 are in order except for the month of November 2004. The Forum may be informed for revised credit given to the complainant.

(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>