



**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**

**Thursday the Eleventh Day of January 2018**

**Appeal No. 38 of 2017**

**Preferred against Order Dt.30.10.2017 of CGRF in  
C.G.No.586/2017-18/Hyderabad Central Circle**

**Between**

**Sri. Surender Mohan, Flat No. 303, Om Sri R.K.Complex, Vittalwadi,  
Narayanaguda, Hyderabad - 500 029. Cell No. 8374139675.**

**... Appellant**

**AND**

- 1. The ADE/OP/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.**
- 2. The AAO/ERO/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.**
- 3. The DE/OP/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.**
- 4. The SE/OP/Hyd. Central Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.**

**... Respondents**

**The above appeal filed on 22.11.2017, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 14.12.2017 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Surender Mohan - Appellant and Sri. M.S.Srinivasan - AAO/ERO/Azamabad 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 SC No.F3005938, Category I at Vittalwadi Narayanguda. He pleaded that excess bills are being issued whenever the consumption is shown as crossing 100 units in a month. The consumer is put in a higher slab at the rate of Rs 3.30 per unit till 199 units. In case the consumption reaches 200 units, the DISCOM is placing the consumer in a further higher slab and thus, the Appellant states that excess billing is taking place. He filed a copy of CC bill for the month of May,2007 stating that it was an example of correct billing. He claimed that excess bills are being issued on increased slab rate and lodged a complaint with the CGRF for rectification.**

2. The 2nd Respondent/AAO/ERO/Azamabad filed written statement dt.6.10.2017 stating that the bill was issued in the month of September,2017 for Rs 417/- based on the consumption recorded in the meter and that there is no excess bill as alleged by the Appellant. He claimed that the CC bill for the month of September,2017 has been issued as per the consumption recorded in the meter and as per the Tariff Order FY 2017-18 and therefore, there is no need for revision of the bill.

3. After considering the material on record and on perusing the EBS statement, the CGRF noted that the consumption for the last 1 year record disclosed about Rs 235, Rs 259 and Rs 431 and in the month of June,2017 the consumption was 109 units and in the month of September,2017 the consumption exceeded 100 units i.e. 107 units and therefore, the Respondents charged the rate per unit as per the Tariff Order for FY 2017-18 and therefore, there is no excess bill as alleged by the Appellant and rejected the complaint through the impugned orders.

4. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned order, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal alleging that in the year, 2007 the billing slab used to be in a systematic way i.e. step by step and the billing procedure was carefully noted after crossing 100 units and that whenever the consumption crossed 100 units per month, he is being put in a higher slab and subjected to higher charges which need rectification.

5. Mediation has not been successful and therefore, the matter is being disposed of on merits.

6. The following issues arise in view of the material on record and the contentions:

1. Whether the CC bill issued for the month of September,2017 is excessive as alleged by the Appellant?
2. Whether the CC bills are being issued after increasing the slab rate than the one applicable?
3. Whether the impugned orders are liable to be set aside?

**Heard.**

**Issues 1 to 3**

7. The Appellant is a consumer with SC No. F3005938, Vittalwadi, Narayanaguda. He opposed the existing slab rate system in the electricity billing in

his case and sought rectification of the billing system. He relied on the CC bill issued to him in the month of May,2007 to compare the procedure.

8. The Appellant has furnished the following calculation of the Electricity bill issued for the said service on 7.5.2007.

SC No. A/c No. G3-001059

	Units : 10653	
		<u>10491</u>
<b>ENERGY CONSUMED</b>		<u>162</u> Units
First 50 Units @ 1.45 Per unit	:	72.50
51 to 100 Units @ 2.80 Per unit	:	140.00
101 to 200 Units @ 3.05 Per unit		<u>189.10</u>
<u>NOTE:</u> Here 62 units @ 3.05 Per units		<u>401.60</u>
62 x 3.05		
(50+50+62 = 162 units) Total Units 162 Units	:	20.00
Customer charges	:	<u>9.72</u>
E.D.Charges	:	<u>431.32</u>
To Round off	:	<u>Rs 431/-</u>

The Appellant questioned about levying higher slab rate @ Rs3.30 per unit till 199 units and Rs 4.30 per unit if consumption crosses 200 units and added to this, he objected over levying of the higher consumer charges adopted @ Rs 50/- per month as against Rs 30/- per month earlier. This example is about 10 years old.

9. The Respondents AAO/ERO/Azamabad through his letter dt.12.12.2017 stated that the Appellant has complained that the meter reader wrongly changed the Category -1A to Category - 1B(i) and requested to revise the bill for the month of September,2017 and submitted the relevant data from the Tariff Schedule 2016-2017:

i. LT Cat-1(A) upto 100 units/month

Units	Rate	Customer charges
0 - 50 Units	1.45	25/-
51-100 Units	2.60	30/-

ii. LT Cat- 1(B)(I) Above 100 Units/month & upto 200 units/month.

Units	Rate	Customer charges
0 - 100 Units	3.30	30/-
101-200 Units	4.30	50/-

The consumer of SC No.F3005938 comes under Cat-1(B)(i) as he has consumed 107 units for the month of 09/2017.

Date	Reading
09.08.2018	5935
09.09.2018	<u>6042</u> 107 Units for 31 days

The details of September,2017 bill are as follows:

For 107 units Energy Charges 100 x 3.30 = 330 7 x 4.30 = 30.10	360.10
Customer Charges	50.00
Electricity Duty (@0.06 paise per unit)	6.42
Electricity Duty Interest	0.04
Loss/gain	0.44
<b>Total</b>	<b>417.00</b>

10. The tariff rates applicable during the year 2007 are not the same when compared with the current rates in Tariff Order 2017-18. From time to time, every year the TSERC would revise the tariff proposals of the DISCOMs under Section 64 of the Electricity Act, 2003 and approve the applicable Tariffs. Therefore, the change in the Tariff requested by the Appellant is not tenable as the CC bills are being issued by the respondents in line with the Tariff Orders FY 2017-18 approved by the TSERC. The Appellant has not brought out any irregularity or unauthorised acts of the Respondents to question the validity of the CC bill. Thus the question of excess CC bills remained unsubstantiated. The issues are answered accordingly.

11. In the result, the Appeal is disposed of as follows:
1. The CC bill issued for the month of September, 2017 is found valid.
  2. There is no instance of issuing CC bills by applying wrong slab.
  3. The impugned orders, though do not contain clear reasons, are confirmed as the conclusion is found correct.
12. The licensee shall comply with and implement this order within 15 days for 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 11th day of January, 2018.

Sd/-

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. Sri. Surender Mohan, Flat No. 303, Om Sri R.K.Complex, Vittalwadi, Narayanaguda, Hyderabad - 500 029. Cell No. 8374139675.
2. The ADE/OP/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Azamabad/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Hyd. Central 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, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.