



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

Tuesday, the Fourth Day of April 2017

Appeal No. 4 of 2017

Preferred against Order Dt. 19-12-2016 of CGRF
in CG No. 543/2016-17/Ranga Reddy East Circle

Between

M/s.BSNL Limited, represented by Sri K.Venkat Ramana, Jr.Telecom Officer (P),
Ibrahimpattam, RR District.501 506. Cell No. 9441000122.

... Appellant

AND

1. The ADE/OP/Ibrahimpattam/TSSPDCL/RR District.
2. The AAO/ERO/Saroornagar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
3. The DE/OP/Saroornagar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
4. The SE/OP/RR East Circle/TSSPDCL/RR District.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 27.01.2017 coming up for hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 07.03.2017 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. K. Venkata Ramana - Appellant and Sri. G. Shyam Prasad - ADE/OP/Ibrahimpattam, Sri. M. Madhav - AAO/ERO/Saroornagar for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The Appellant M/s BSNL Ltd., Rangapur Exchange, Ibrahimpattam is a consumer with SC No. 5028 00225. The DISCOM issued CC bills for September,2016 and October,2016 based on average consumption of units. The Appellant termed the issue of CC bills as high and claimed that CC bill for July,2016 issued for Rs 11,858/- is excessive and not based on consumption of energy. The Appellant sought revision of these bills and lodged a complaint with CGRF.

2. Before the CGRF, the 2nd Respondent/AAO/ERO/Saroor Nagar through letter dt.26.11.2016 stated that the CC bill was revised from February,2016 to July,2016 and an amount of Rs 1,887/- would be withdrawn.

3. After considering the material on record, the CGRF observed that since the grievance of the Appellant was redressed by withdrawing an amount of Rs 1,887/- after revising the bills from February,2016 to July,2016, no further orders need be passed and disposed of the complaint, through the impugned orders.

4. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Junior Telecom Officer representing the Appellant preferred the present Appeal on the ground that the excess bill issued for the month of July,2016 for Rs 11,868/- and issue of CC bills based on average consumption for September,2016 and October,2016 are high amounts and need verification and that the power factor is faulty and that placing reliance on power factor and billing on KVAH is not correct and that the excess amount needs to be withdrawn.

5. Pending Appeal, the 2nd Respondent AAO/ERO/Saroor Nagar submitted through a letter dt.14.2.2017 that a further amount of Rs 5,922/- has been withdrawn vide JE No. 5051 dt.14.2.2017.

6. The efforts at mediation failed, and therefore, the matter is being disposed of on merits.

7. On the basis of the material on record and contentions, the following issues arise for determination:

1. Whether the Appellant is entitled to rectification of CC bills of September and October,2016?
2. Whether CC bills issued for September and October,2016 based on monthly average consumption by the DISCOM is correct?
3. Whether CC bill issued for the month of July,2016 for Rs 11,868/- is excessive and needs revision?
4. Whether the impugned orders are liable to be set aside?

Issues 1 to 4

8. The Appellant claimed revision of bills in two instances:

- (a) July,2016 - Rs 11,868/ - abnormal consumption claimed citing defective meter
- (b) Sep,2016 and Oct,2016 - High Average Units adopted for two months during struck up and meter change period.

The CGRF has given relaxation for point (a) above by withdrawing an amount of Rs.1,887/-. The CGRF has not addressed the point(b). Hence the appellant further demands higher amount to be withdrawn.

The following are the PF and billing details of the service connection as furnished in the CC bills:-

Month	KVAH units	Pf (power factor)	Amount
Oct- 16	584 (04)	1.00	5950
Sep - 16	584 (02)	1.00	5950
Aug - 16	219 (01)	1.00	2625
Jul - 16	1218 (01)	<u>0.17</u>	11868
June - 16	315 (01)	1.00	3165
May - 16	209 (01)	0.98	2411

9. **The claim of Abnormal consumption in the month of July,2016 billed for an amount of Rs 11,868/-**

In the month of July-16, a CC bill was issued for an amount of Rs.11,868 for consumption of 1218 units, which the Appellant is contesting. If the periodical readings of the service connection are to be compared, the consumption recorded in July, of 1218 units is almost 2 to 5 times the previous 3 years average consumption. Hence, the abnormality in units is patent.

The Appellant asserted that p.f of 0.17 recorded for the month of July,2016 is due to technical fault and consequently, KVAH units recorded are high i.e, 1218 units which the Respondents have denied.

10. In order to understand the dispute over recording of less p.f, it is necessary to know what is a **power factor**.

Power factor is the ratio of KWH/KVAH

KWH recorded is 205 units

KVAH recorded is 1218 units

P.f. = $205/1218 = 0.17$

What causes low power factor?

The Inductive loads (which are the sources of Reactive Power) causes low p.f.,

Such as

- (i) Transformers
- (ii) Induction motors
- (iii) Induction generators
Or Alternators.

11. There is no record in place regarding connected load of the Exchange of BSNL. The Appellant neither gave any basis for claim that the less P.F. of 0.17 shown is abnormal, nor has it given any source of information, but relied on a technical doubt. To analyse the clear picture on why suddenly the P.F fell drastically only in that month, the following factors are found:

It is a known fact that power factor directly depends on the load connected to the Meter. The two factors leading to recording such lowest P.F are

- a) Faulty recording instrument i.e. Energy Meter. (Claimed by the Appellant)
- b) Impact of the connected load during the month.

12. If the energy meter is considered to be defective during the month of July,2016, the same faulty energy meter recorded the pf as 1(one) in the following month of August,2016. Hence, the possibility of getting defective result at one time and getting autocorrect subsequently, is highly doubtful. The most likely reason could be some disturbance in the load, which resulted in the irregularity and possible discrepancy. The enquiry for further investigation ceased when the energy meter got 'No Display'. The AE/OP/ Manchal reported on the intimation of AE/LT Meter that testing the meter would not yield correct fault conclusively.

13. The Appellant contended that the recording of P.F as 0.17 is technically not possible and the KVAH consumption recorded 1218 units as against KWH consumption as 208 units is abnormal, which could be due to a defect in the meter. The Appellant

contended that there is no possibility of existence of P.F as low as 0.17 in the present matter.

The following are P.F patterns corresponding to various loads of induction motors

Full load, pf= 0.8-0.9

Small load, pf= 0.2-0.3

No load, pf may come to Zero(0)

The above statistics reveal that attaining such low pf's are also possible under certain load conditions. The Appellant's contention of technical fault due to recording of pf as 0.17 can be discounted. Under the circumstances, the claim of the Appellant that Low Power Factor is only due to the defective meter is not tenable.

14. High Average Units assessed/adopted for two months towards struck up and meter change period for the months of Sep,2016 and Oct,2016:

The next claim of the Appellant that the average units taken are very high for 584 units each month, during the two months of NO DISPLAY and Meter change period, in the months of September and October,2016 based on previous months consumption, which included disputed 1218 units in the month of July, is tenable. This plea of the Appellant has not been answered by the CGRF. The 2nd Respondent, AAO/ERO/Saroornagar submitted in the Appeal that the bills were revised and an amount of Rs 5922/- was withdrawn vide JE No. 5051 dt.14.2.2017.

15. The Respondents have adopted the average bills for the months of August and September,2016 for struck up and meter change period and have actually billed for the months of August,2016 and September,2016 with 584 average units per month as follows:-

The Average units of 584 were revised by taking three months consumption

$$= 219 + 291 + 314 = 824$$

$$\text{Average for 3 months} = 824/3 = 275 \text{ units per month}$$

$$\text{Revised bill for 275 units} = 100 \times 7.5 = 750$$

$$= 175 \times 8.9 = 1557.5$$

$$= 2307.5$$

$$\text{ED} = 16.5$$

$$\text{CC} = \underline{65.0}$$

$$2389 \text{ Per month}$$

$$\text{For two months} = 2389 \times 2 = 4778$$

Now revised = 10700(already billed) - 4778(to be billed after revision)
= 5922(to be withdrawn)

Rs 5922/- was withdrawn vide JE No. 5051 dt.14.02.2017 of the 2nd Respondent.

16. The above revision was carried out based on the recorded units of old meter, where the Appellant questioned the correctness of the meter. The recorded consumption of new healthy meter with normal consumption period i.e Dec,16 to Feb,17 = 116, 85 and 178 Units has to be taken to arrive at probable average consumption.

Total Units = 116+85+178 = 379

Monthly average = 379/3 = 126 Units

Revised bill taking 126 units as average per month:

= 100 x 7.5 = 750

= 26 x 8.9 = 231.4

Total = 981.4

ED = 7.56

CC = 65.00

1054 Per month

For two months, the CC charges would be based on average consumption = 1054 x 2 = Rs 2108/-. Based on this average, the Amount to be withdrawn would be = Rs 10,700/-(already billed) - Rs 2108/-(revised amount for two months) = Rs 8592/- to be withdrawn.

17. It is clear from the aforementioned reasons, the Appellant is entitled to withdrawal of Rs 8,582/- from the total demand of Rs 10,700/- instead of Rs 5,922/- as mentioned by the AAO/ERO/Saroornagar through his letter pending appeal. The impugned orders thus are found not deciding the controversy in the correct perspective and liable to be set aside. The issues are answered accordingly.

18. The Appeal is allowed directing as follows:-

- a. The Appellant is found not entitled to rectification of CC bill for Rs 11,868/- for the month of July,2016.
- b. The Appellant is found entitled to rectification of bills for the months of September and October,2016 with a direction to the DISCOM to withdraw an amount of Rs 8,592/- from the demand of Rs 10,700/- raised by way of CC bills.

- c. The CC bills issued based on monthly average calculated by the DISCOM, in view of the foregoing reasons, is found not correct.
- d. The impugned orders are set aside.

19. This award shall be implemented within 15 days of its receipt at the risk of penalties as indicated in Clauses 3.38, 3.39 and 3.42 of the Regulation No. 3/2015 of TSERC.

TYPED BY CCO, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 4th day of April, 2017

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

1. M/s.BSNL Limited, represented by Sri K.Venkat Ramana, Jr.Telecom Office (P), Ibrahimpatnam, R R District.501 506. Cell No. 9441000122.
2. The ADE/OP/Ibrahimpatnam/TSSPDCL/RR District
3. The AAO/ERO/Saroonnagar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
4. The DE/OP/Saroonnagar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
5. The SE/OP/RR East Circle/TSSPDCL/RR District.

Copy to:

6. The Chairperson, CGRF,TSSPDCL, Greater Hyderabad Area, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad..
7. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills,Hyderabad.