



VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

:: Present:: R. DAMODAR

Friday the Ninth Day of March 2018

Appeal No. 42 of 2017

Preferred against Order Dt.27.11.2017 of CGRF in
C.G.No.637/2017-18/Secunderabad Circle

Between

Sri. D. Satish Babu, Plot No. 303, H.No.1-23-286/4, Telecom Colony,
Kanajiguda, Secunderabad - 500 015. Cell: 9490090040.

... Appellant

AND

1. The ADE/OP/Lal Bazaar/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
2. The AAO/ERO/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
3. The DE/OP/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
4. The SE/OPSecunderabad Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 27.12.2017, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 31.01.2018 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. D. Satish Babu- Appellant and Sri. M.A.Kaleem - AAO/ERO/R.P.Nilayam, Sri. D.S.Reddy - ADE/OP/Lal Bazar for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The Appellant is a consumer with S C No. AZ039351. He sought rectification of excess bill issued for Rs 3,363/- for the old meter consumption of 440 units in February,2017. He claimed that he never consumed those many units since only 2 persons reside in the premises. On his complaint, the meter was tested and the MRT lab report disclosed huge abnormal consumption showing 223 units for 11 days and 251 units for 17 days, which he claimed as practically impossible.

2. The AE/O/Lal Bazar through letter dt.24.10.2017 stated on behalf of the Respondents that the lineman had inspected the service and noted the check reading

which is tallying with the bill issued. The consumer has been advised to pay Rs 300/- towards the meter testing charges and on payment, the meter was tested on 17.01.2017 in the MRT lab. The report was that the meter was normal. On inspection of the premises of the Appellant, One 5 HP submersible pump and two motors each 373 watts, One 1.5 tons Air Conditioner, 8 fans, 54 bulbs of 15 watt CFL, one 100 watt bulb, One Air Cooler, One refrigerator of 280 ltrs, One Chimney, 1 Aquaguard Water purifier, Oven, Rice cooker, one mixer, Tube light and Computer were found.

3. The 1st Respondent ADE/O/Lal Bazar stated about the MRT lab report of the meter, the replacement of the meter with IR port meter on 17.01.2017.

4. After hearing, the CGRF examined the MRT lab report, the claim of the Appellant, found that there is no abnormal bill issued as alleged by the Appellant and rejected the complaint through the impugned orders.

5. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal claiming that for calculation of the load, the input and output load should be tested and just by noting the electrical instruments, the load factor cannot be measured, the service connection has never consumed 440 units in 17 days and it is definitely less than 100 units even in summer. Further while noting the load, one HP motor and two 0.5 HP motors are shown as two 5 HP motors, which is not correct.

6. The 1st Respondent/ADE/O/Lal Bazar filed a report dt.28.10.2017 showing the connected load totalling 4645 watts, in support of the claim of the DISCOM about the consumption pattern. The MRT report is filed showing that after testing 6 months data recorded in the meter, the laboratory observed that the meter error is within the permissible limit.

7. Efforts at mediation failed to succeed and therefore, the matter is being disposed of on merits.

8. Based on material on record, the following issues arise for determination:

1. Whether the CC bill for the month of February,2017 showing the old meter reading consumption of 440 units for Rs 3363/- is excessive as alleged by the Appellant?
2. Whether the impugned orders are liable to be set aside?

Issues 1 and 2

9. The Appellant pleaded for rectification of excess bill issued to his Service Connection No. AZ039351 stating that the Respondents had issued an excess bill for Rs 3,363/- for the old meter reading (Meter changed later) consumption of 440 units issued in February,2017. He stated that only 2 persons have been residing in the premises and they never consumed that many units.

10. The Appellant further stated that the referred meter had never recorded 440 units in 17 days right from the installation of the meter. Even during the summer period, the recorded units were around 200 per month and for other period it was less than 100 units. He claimed that in the same month i.e. during January for the next 17 days, only 36 units have been recorded. He stated that the new meter replaced with IR port has also not showed that much consumption in the following months, including summer.

11. The Appellant questioned the authenticity of the meter testing report involving 6 months data, wherein various dates have been selected for uneven durations like 54,21,37,11,47 & 17 days. According to him the physical verification is for about one month which is the usual practice and this taking of uneven days for checking is suspicious.

12. The 1st Respondent, ADE/OP/Lalbazar submitted his statement in the Appeal as follows:

- a) On the complaint of the appellant about excess recording of consumption by the Hawells make meter bearing SL. No. 398186, with capacity 10-40A, with final reading 7139.4 KWH was tested on 17-1-2017 at MRT LT meters LAB in the presence of the Appellant.
- b) The ADE/MRT vide letter dt.18-01-2017 submitted a report after testing the meter in the lab with the comment that “the meter is tested with ERS kit and the meter error is found within the permissible limit”.
- c) With the consent of the Appellant, the old non IR meter with final reading 7139.4 KWH has been replaced with a new Genus meter with 0 KWH initial reading with IR compatibility to eliminate manual interference in meter reading and to improve the consumer satisfaction.

d) The AAE/OP/Lalbazar had inspected the premises on 27-10-2017 in the presence of D.Satish Babu and found the following connected load.

LOAD PARTICULARS:

1	Sitting Room	CFL Bulbs:4X5	20W
2	Hall	Cooler:1X80 Fan: 1X60 CFL:14X5 Tube Light:1X15 Bulb:1X60 Table Fan:1X40 TV:1X110	80W 60W 70W 15W 60W 40W 110W
3	Bed Room	AC:1X1500 Fan:1X60 CFL:7X5 Electric Iron:1X750	1500W 60W 35W 750W
4	Bath Room	CFL:1X5	05W
5	Kitchen	Fridge:280 Ltrs Fan:1X60 Oven:1X750 Aqua Guard:1X110 CFL:4X5 Chimney:1X210	300W 60W 750W 110W 20W 210W
6	First Floor	CFL:16X1	80W
7	Bed Room 1	Fan:1X60	60W
8	Bed Room 2	CFL:6X5 Fan:1X60 CFL:8X5 Computer:1X120	30W 60W 40W 120W
Total Connected Load:			4645 Watts

e) He stated that the meter function is normal based on the test report of the MRT lab. The contention of the consumer that only two persons are residing in the premises and they have not consumed 440 Units of energy in the month of February, 2017 is not correct and there is no abnormality in the bill.

13. The dispute relates to excess bill claimed by the appellant for 476 units issued in the month of February, 2017 for an amount of Rs 3363/-. Based on the complaint of the Appellant, the Respondents referred the meter for testing at LT Meters Lab. The meter was tested on 17-1-2017 with ERS kit and the ADE/MRT reported that the errors in the meter are within the permissible limit and no abnormality of

functioning of meter was found. The referred meter bearing Sl. No. 398186 found to be working normally had no IR(Infrared) port. On the consent of the Appellant, the meter has been replaced with a new meter of Genus make having IR port with initial reading as zero. For the old meter without IR port, the monthly readings were being taken manually i.e the actual reading seen from the meter used to be entered in the Spot Billing Machine (SBM) and bills were being issued accordingly.

14. The DISCOM, in order to eliminate manual interference in the billing, has started replacing all the existing non IR port electronic energy meters with IR port electronic energy meters. This IR port meters have the facility for remote reading from a minimum distance of 1.5 meters with the help of ISBM(integrated spot billing machine) to facilitate the DISCOM for the auto reading, billing the consumer on the spot and downloading of 6 months of data for future use. This possesses suitable fast and reliable infrared communication for data transfer and there is no possibility of tampering with the data stored in the meter, even with the password of the software.

15. The Appellant asserted that even after replacement with the IR port meter, the monthly consumption has been maximum upto 200 units, that too during summer and his consumption has never showed around 400 units before replacement of the meter i.e prior to January 2017. Only in the disputed billing month, the monthly consumption is shown as 476 units. The breakup of the disputed month consumed units are shown as evidence for abnormal billing i.e the old meter disclosed 440 units in 17 days and whereas, in the next 17 days, 36 units were consumed. The MRT lab report shows the meter as working normally.

16. The following is the 6 months data recorded in the meter retrieved in the MRT lab:

S.No	KWH(Reading)	M.D(KW)(Recorded)	Date	Time
1	7007.6	1.810	16.12.20	21.00
2	6756.2	1.080	16.11.03	00.00
3	6519.1	1.200	16.10.23	19.00
4	6296.0	0.780	16.09.16	18.00
5	6208.2	0.970	16.08.25	00.00
6	6112.4	1.160	16.07.02	23.30

17. The following are the periodical readings for the same period of the 6 months data retrieved from the meter in the MRT lab :

S.No	Month/Year	Status	Closing reading	units(KWH)
1	Dec/2016	01	6543	99
2	Nov/2016	01	6444	138
3	Oct/2016	01	6306	88
4	Sep/2016	01	6218	62
5	Aug/2016	01	5995	161
6	Jul/2016	01	5995	111

18. Usually taking of LT meter readings commences during the first week of the month. The captured 6 months data shows readings recorded during the first week for the months of July and November, 2016. When compared with the manual readings taken for the month of July, it shows that there is a difference of 117 units. And for the month of November, the difference gets increased to 312 units. It shows that the manual readings do not tally with the captured data of the old meter. Where there is no possibility to interfere with the captured data, which can be taken as the actual and correct reading. There is a possibility of wrong readings if furnished manually. Since there's no material to show that the meter is defective, the final reading of the old meter i.e, 7139.4 has to be invariably billed.

19. With a view to put a stop to the dispute, the difference of 312 units shall be apportioned equally from the month of July, 2016 to February, 2017 i.e 312 units divided by 8 months which is equal to 39 units. Thus the bills shall be revised retrospectively from the months of July,2016 to February, 2017 duly adding 39 units for each month and from out of the earlier accumulated consumption of 476 units, a total of 312 units shall be deducted and fresh CC bills should be issued and appropriate adjustments shall be made. The issues are answered accordingly.

20. In the result, the Appeal is disposed of as follows:

- a) The CC bill for the month of February,2017 showing old meter reading consumption of 440 units for Rs 3,363/- is found to be excessive for one month.
- b) The difference of 312 units shall be apportioned equally from the month of July,2016 to February,2017 which is equal to 39 units per month. Thus, the bills

shall be revised retrospectively from the month of July,2016 to February,2017 duly adding 39 units for each month and from out of the earlier accumulated consumption of 476 units, a total of 312 units shall be deducted and fresh CC bills shall be issued and appropriate adjustments shall be made.

c) The impugned orders are accordingly set aside.

20. The licensee shall comply with and implement this order within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order under clause 3.38 of the Regulation 3 of 2015 of TSERC.

TYPED BY Clerk Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 9th day of March, 2018.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Sri. D. Satish Babu, Plot No. 303, H.No.1-23-286/4, Telecom Colony, Kanajiguda, Secunderabad - 500 015. Cell: 9490090040
2. The ADE/OP/Lal Bazaar/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Secunderabad Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

Copy to :

6. The Chairperson, Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Greater Hyderabad Area, TSSPDCL, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad - 500 045.
7. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.