

**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-IV-153-2013.14
Complainant	Shri Laxmanbhai Raybhanbhai Parmar P.O. Later Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist : Kheda
Respondent	Shri R.B.Vankar, Junior Engineer of Kapadwanj REC S/dn of MGVCCL
Date of hearing	07.03.2014 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 24.02.2014 regarding to give agricultural vij connection under Dark Zone Yojana.

On 07.03.2014, the case of the Complainant Grievance was heard before Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum wherein Shri Laxmanbhai Raybhanbhai Parmar appeared himself, whereas Shri R.B.Vankar, Junior Engineer of Kapadwanj REC S/dn of MGVCCL as respondent on behalf of MGVCCL before the Forum. Both the parties were heard.

The brief details of the case are :

1. Shri Laxmanbhai Raybhanbhai Parmar, had applied for new vij connection in LS No.268/4 village Later and registered at GP No.130 on 29.12.1998.
2. GGRC had issued work order No.KH4923 which was auto cancelled due to non-payment of estimate to GGRC. The complainant had paid estimate Rs.13170/- dtd.16.10.2012 to M/S Dharti Agritech but the work order amount was not credited to GGRC by M/s. Dharti Agrotech.
3. MGVCCL has cancelled application due to nonpayment of GGRC work order.(Default was due to non payment by M/S Dharti agro tech to GGRC).

4. GGRC has regenerated work order No.8267 dated 28.11.2013, but the MGVCCL has informed to the applicant that based on auto cancellation of previous WO No.4923, his application is already cancelled.
5. The applicant has requested the forum to give justice as cheating done by M/S Dharti agro tech for which he is at all not responsible.

The complainant contended that he was unaware of the WO No.4923 issued by GGRC. He has paid Rs.13170/ to M/s. Dharti Agrotech as asked by them. He made frequent inquiries to contracting agency but no response given. After some follow up, GGRC has issued new work order bearing No.8267 and agency name M/s. Balson Polyplast P Ltd., FPA is also signed but MGVCCL has informed that his application is already cancelled by the GGRC due to non-payment of their WO No 4923 within its time limit of 180 days. He is unaware of such activities of work order and its time limit and requested to consider his application to process GGRC WO No.KH 8267.

The respondent contended that Shri Laxmanbhai Raybhanbhai Parmar, had applied for new vij connection in LS No. 268/4 at village later and registered as GP No. 130 on 29.12.1998. WO No. 4923 was issued by GGRC. GGRC has cancelled it after laps of 180 days on the basis of non-completion of FPA by the applicant. The actual lapse was on part of M/S Dharti agro tech, who has not processed further to GGRC, then W.O.No.8267 was regenerated on dtd.25.11.2013 on the name of M/s. Balson Polyplast P Ltd. The work order amount Rs.7901/ was credited to GGRC by the agency from the amount paid by the applicant to M/s. Dharti Sales (Rs.13170/-). MGVCCL has cancelled his application for non-payment GGRC work order on dtd.04.01.2014 due to lapse of limit of 180 days for original work order. He confirms FPA signed for new work order No.8267 before issuance of cancellation order.

The Forum Members present at the hearing considered contention of both the parties and perused the records and observed that work order generated by GGRC is addressed to the Agency with a copy to MGVCCL, for which complainant

has paid estimate Rs.13170 /- to M/S Dharti agro tech on 16.10.2012, but same was not processed to GGRC. Forum noted the lacuna in processing the application by Dharti agro tech. After frequent follow-ups with Dharti agro tech another W.O.8267 was issued on 25.11.2013 on the name of M/s. Balson Polyplast P Ltd, the amount is Rs.7901/- which was credited by the agency to GGRC. As the complainant was not aware of earlier process and subsequent progress, the new WO is processed upto signing of FPA. Meanwhile, MGVCL cancelled his application on dtd.04.01.2014.

The forum is of the opinion that the applicant has paid the charges in time and no proper communication done with the applicant either by the GGRC and its agencies or MGVCL so applicant is not at fault and MGVCL should process regenerated WO No.8267.

ORDER

The Forum directs the Madhya Gujarat Vij Co Limited to process for new agriculture connection to complainant Shri Laxmanbhai Raybhanbhai Parmar Later Tal: Kapadwanj, Dist : Kheda. The Forum also directs to take up the matter with GGRC for lacuna in their system and refund of over payment made by the applicant.

(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>