

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN
O/o: ANDHRA PRADESH ELECTRICITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Hyderabad – 500 004

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated 09- 12-2011

Appeal No. 69 of 2011

Between
Md. Shashavali
S/o: Md.Moosa,
D.No. 17/239, Geeta Talkies Road,
Guntakal, Anantapur District

..... Appellant

And

1. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Guntakal D-1/CPDCL/Anantapur District
2. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Guntakal/CPDCL/Anantapur District
3. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Guntakal/CPDCL/Anantapur District
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Gooty/CPDCL/Anantapur District

..... Respondents

The appeal / representation is received on 21-09-2011 (received on 23-09-2011) against the CGRF order of APCPDCL (in CG No.ATP-100/dt: 02-07-2011/ 2011-12/ Anantapur Circle 16-08-2011). The same has come up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 16-11-2011. Md. Shashavali S/o: Md.Moosa, present and Sri P.V.Ramesh DE/O/Gooty, Sri M.Prasad, ADE/O/Guntakal, Sri G.Sreenivasulu, AAE/D2/Guntakal and Sri L.Parathasarathy, AAO/ERO/Guntakal on behalf of respondents present, heard and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed/issued the following:

AWARD

The appellant filed a complaint before the Forum stating that he has complained in the Prajavani meeting on 30-05-2011 regarding excess bill. While his problem was not solved, his service was disconnected between July 1 and 8, 2011, he made past payment and had the service reconnected; and that he is entitled for refund of the said amount.

2. The third Respondent, in his written submission stated that the meter was replaced with a class – I LT Trivector meter in February last. Therefore kVAH reading was not appearing.

3. The Forum examined the complainant and also examined the respondents 1 to 3. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

“The First Respondent is directed to regularize the load reduction, also replace the meter for suitable kVAH reading and inform the ERO about it for revising the bill accordingly.

The complaint is disposed off accordingly.”

4. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the Forum has failed to consider about the reduction of HP from 20 to 15HP and with regard to abnormal bill received by him and the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

5. Now, the point for consideration is, “whether the impugned order is liable to be set aside? If so, on what grounds?”

6. The Forum has also directed the respondents to regularise the load reduction by replacing the meter to suitable kVAH reading and inform the same to the ERO about the said revision for revising the bill accordingly.

7. The appellant who appeared before this authority stated that he received abnormal bill as the department has failed to reduce the KVAH. Whereas, the respondents represented by Sri P.V.Ramesh DE/O/Gooty, Sri M.Prasad, ADE/O/Guntakal, Sri G.Sreenivasulu, AAE/D2/Guntakal and Sri L.Parathasarathy, AAO/ERO/Guntakal present and stated that they have not received any application for reduction of the KVAH and they are prepared to do the same soon after receiving the application from the appellant and the bills are paid in accordance with the usage made by the appellant and there is no defect in the meter and even though they have changed the meter in the month of February with a class-I LT Trivector meter and the KVAH reading is not appearing.

8. The contention of the appellant is that it is on account of defect in the meter. His consumption is very meagre for all the other months; and that he was forced to pay the amount though abnormal and the amount which was erroneously made. He has also requested this authority to get the meter tested and if it is found that there is any defect in the meter, the excess bills may be reduced to its normal. The request made by the appellant

is justified and also proper direction is to be issued to respondents to send the meter for testing on payment of necessary charges by the appellant and if it is found defective, the excess bills may be ordered to be reduced.

9. In the result, the respondents are directed to reduce from 20HP to 15HP soon after receiving an application from the appellant. The appellant is also directed to submit an application for reduction of KVAH immediately. The meter has to be sent to test on payment of necessary charges by the appellant and if it is found defective in the said test, the excess bills may be corrected accordingly. No order as to costs.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 9th December 2011

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN