

**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-II-62-2014.15
Complainant	Shri Babubhai Mangalbhai Parmar, Dudh Utpadak Sahakari Mandali Limited, At & Post : Vyasjina Muvada, Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist : Kheda
Respondent	Shri G S Patel Deputy Engineer & Shri K B Patel Dy SA of Kapadwanj s/dn of MGVCCL
Date of hearing	19.09.2014 & 26.09.2014 both at Vadodara

QUORUM	NAME
Chairperson	Shri P J Patel, Gandhinagar
Independent Member	Harsha S Chauhan, Vadodara
Technical Member	Medha M Marathe, MGVCCL

The complaint dated 11.09.2014 regarding high energy bill & shown “F” status in the energy bill.

On 19.09.2014 & 26.09.2014, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri Babubhai Mangalbhai Parmar appeared himself on behalf of Dudh Utpadak Sahakari Mandali Limited whereas Shri G S Patel Deputy Engineer & Shri K B Patel Dy SA of Kapadwanj s/dn appeared as respondent on behalf of MGVCCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The brief details of the case are :

1. The complainant Shri Babubhai Mangalbhai Parmar is a Secretary of Dudh Utpadak Sahakari Mandali Limited At & Post : Vyasjina Muvada, Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist : Kheda.
2. Kapadwanj s/dn office of MGVCCL had given “F” status in the energy bill for several months and bill of Rs.74162.67 was issued for the month of April May 2014.
3. The complainant has taken objection for very high amount of bill against their bi-monthly billing around Rs.6000/-.
4. On giving complaint to MGVCCL, the faulty meter was got tested at site but again in next bill “F” status was given.

5. It is not understood why “L” status and “F” status bills are being issued when meter is in working condition.
6. As his grievances for high bill for the month of April May 2014 is not resolved, that bill is not paid.
7. Instead resolving the grievances, MGVCL had disconnected the connection.
8. The complainant has requested to check all records and give justice to them.

The complainant contended that their connection is disconnected by MGVCL on 17.09.2014 for their unpaid amount of Rs.42273/-. MGVCL has removed the meter and service line also. They have checked their records and observed that MGVCL had issued 3 nos LOCK status bills and 3 nos FAULTY status bills and thereafter 7th bill of very huge amount on dated 24.5.2014. They have raised their grievances against this high amount bill to s/dn of MGVCL. MGVCL has got meter tested and reported that meter is correct so they have paid Rs.15000/ on dated 15.07.2014. again in next month bill dated 27.07.2014, meter reader had issued bill with “F” status for which their management has taken objection for wrong billing and no fault on their part and directed him not to pay energy bills thereafter without solution of their grievances. Instead of resolving the grievances, MGVCL has taken one sided action to disconnect their connection. There is no fault on their part. They are running their Dudh Mandali on cooperation basis. They have chilling plant also for their consumers who are suffering with loss of revenue. The Doodh Mandali has to run DG set which is extra burden to the Mandali and to their consumers. The forum is requested to look into the matter and to order to reconnect the connection.

The respondent contended that connection was released on 21.07.2011 and applicable tariff is NRGP. He confirmed that “L” & “F” status given in the energy bills by meter reader and upon inquiry this was due to higher elevation of installed meter so meter reader could not take reading. When complaint received to them their office has recalculated by bifurcating the

units consumed including “L” & “F” status period. Revised bill was issued on 31.07.2014 for the amount of Rs.42273.59 with due date i.e. 6.8.2014. As such bills were not paid, connection was disconnected on 17.09.2014.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and observed reason for not taking readings due to meter installed at higher elevation is not proper. The connection released on 21.07.2011 and thereafter bills were issued as per consumption recorded in the meter till Feb March 2013 the meter reader had given “L” status in the bills issue from April May 2013 to August Sept 2013 and “F” status from October November 2013 to April May 2014. During this period, bills issued by meter reader and computerized billing is attached as Annexure-A herewith. There is wide difference between physical bills issued and computerized billing amount. The consumer has paid all bills till Feb March 2014 as per physical bills issued. During this, “L” & “F” status period and average bills for 780 units were given. In April May 2014 bills, meter reader has noted actual reading and difference of actual reading and last reading of Feb March 2013 comes to 10870 units for which Rs.74162.67, this amount has not paid by the consumer and consumer has raised the objection for such higher bills so MGVCL has got meter inspected at site through accurate meter on 24.06.2014 and reported meter functioning correctly. In computerized billing, this actual reading taken by meter reader in the bill of April May 2014 is not affected and only average 780 units considered. This changes reflected in computerized billing, during billing month June July 2014 and issued bill for 12263 units amounting to Rs.83366.61. The consumer had paid Rs.15,000/- on 15.07.2014 as per discussion with Deputy Engineer, Kapadwanj Rural s/dn, MGVCL. As per computerized billing data, after 2 months “L” status, 3rd time consumption considered as ZERO and amount bill in previous “L” status are adjusted i.e. given correctly. In Short, from April May 2013 to June July 2014, gross amount payable by the consumer is Rs.87598.12 and consumer has paid total Rs.14287/- including last payment of Rs.15000/-, considering opening balance having credit of Rs.290.52 and

interest on Security Deposit Rs.259.42 net amount payable by the consumer is Rs.42,761.48.

In view of the above discussion, the Forum is of the opinion that there is no fault on the part of consumer and they have paid bills as per bills issued to them. Grievances raised due to correct billing system and computer system problems. Consumer is a cooperative Dudh Mandali, responsible for all accounting so any abnormal huge payment cannot be done without proper clarification. MGVL is failed to give justifiable clarification to applicant which has lead to non-payment of dues in time, representative of consumer is ready to pay eligible due amount to them and requested to give four instalments as on the day of hearing such huge mount is not on available on hand for Bank. The Forum agree to give two instalments. First instalment of Rs.20000/- with reconnection charges immediately to reconnect power supply and balance amount along with next billing cycle. Representative of the consumer agreed for the same.

ORDER

The Forum directed consumer Shri Babubhai Mangalbhai Parmar, Dudh Utpadak Sahakari Mandali Limited, At & Post : Vyasjina Muvada, Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist : Kheda, to pay an arrears of Rs.42761.48 in two instalments, first being Rs.20,000/- The Forum is directed to MGVL to look into such issues of improper billing due to incorrect elevation energy meter, improper billing issue at site which is not matching with the computer billing system to reduce the grievances of consumer.

(Medha M Marathe)
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 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>