



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

:: Present:: Smt. UDAYA GOURI

Monday the Eleventh Day of March 2019

**Appeal No. 53 of 2018**

Preferred against Order dt:17.11.2018 of CGRF in  
CG No. 202/2018 of Karimnagar Circle

Between

Sri. M. Srikanth, Jawaharlal Nehru College, Vemulawada (M), Siricilla,  
Karimnagar - Dist. Cell: 9963647370.

... Appellant

**AND**

1. The AE/OP/Town/Vemulawada - 9440814075.
2. The ADE/OP/Vemulawada - 9490610236.
3. The AAO/ERO/Vemulawada - 9440814064.
4. The DE/OP/CESS-2/Sircilla - 9440814059.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 02.01.2019, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 13.02.2019 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. M. Sreekanth - Appellant and R.Anusha - AE/OP/Vemulawada town and Sri. A. Devender Kumar - AAO/ERO/Vemulawada for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

**AWARD**

This is an Appeal filed against the orders of the CGRF/Karimnagar Circle in CG No.202/2018 dt.17.11.2018.

2. The averments made in the Appeal are as follows:-

The Appellant stated that he has filed a complaint vide CG No.202/2018 seeking to withdraw the excess bills billed against their Service Connection No. 20201 06138 in the month of April,2018 and the learned CGRF failed to appreciate the fact that the bill for the month of April,2018 was not in accordance of their consumption per

month throughout the year and that it was exorbitant in spite of their contentions that there were only two tube lights, two bulbs and three fans and as such aggrieved by the order of the said CGRF they have filed the present Appeal.

3. The Appellant namely Sri. M. Srikanth who is the Administrative Officer, Jawaharlal Nehru College, Vemulawada stated that SC No. 20201 06138 was allotted to the guest house in their college, consisting of two rooms having two tube lights, two bulbs and three fans and that in the month of April,2018 the Respondents have issued a bill for an amount of Rs 1,60,634/- stating that they have consumed units to an extent of 16060 in the said month and when they questioned them they were told that an inspection was conducted in their premises and the said units were recorded for the said service connection. The Appellant further stated that they have never seen anyone inspecting the said premises nor the records of the Respondents show the signature of the person who is alleged to have conducted the inspection. They also contended that the question of their inspecting the said premises without their knowledge does not arise. They also claimed that their average consumption per month in the previous months is taken into consideration they show that the consumption billed in the month of April,2018 is abnormal and as such they reported the same to the electricity officials who in turn referred the meter to LT metering lab at Sircilla to check the functioning of the meter but since the said lab gave a finding that the meter was normal and so they protested against the said finding, as such the meter was again sent to Karimnagar Vidyut Mandali Lab. At Karimnagar the lab authorities postponed the matter and ultimately after examination the meter was fixed in their college premises in the end of August, 2018. Later after examining the consumption they found that 9 units were consumed but the Respondents billed the amount only for 6 units and when they pointed out they corrected the same, but again for the month of October and November they have shown the meter opening reading as 16813 units and closing reading as 16813, but billed the same for a nominal amount of Rs 310/-. They pointed out that the said recording of units and the method of billing done by the Respondents clearly shows their indifference towards the consumers. Hence prayed that the meter reading for the month of August,2018 showing the consumption as 16060 units for an amount of Rs 1,60,634/- be rectified and the excess bill issued to them be withdrawn.

4. The Respondents on the other hand filed their written submissions through Respondent No.3 vide their letter No. DE/CESS/Estt/D.No.176/2019 dt.Nil

stated that as per the Cooperative Electric Supply Society Ltd. Sircilla, the Appellant Jawaharlal Nehru College is having Service Connection No. 20201 06138 with an outstanding arrears of Rs 1,68,082/- by August,2018. And on the application of the Appellant seeking for revision of the bill before the CGRF on 06.07.2018 in the Lok Adalat, the CGRF disposed the matter, after considering the records that the case of the Appellant was a case of accumulation of readings of the meter and that the meter was in order as such directed the Appellant to pay the bills and asked the Respondents to provide the Appellant the choice of payment by instalments and the Appellant instead of complying with the said order approached the Ombudsman without any ground. Hence prayed that the Appeal be dismissed.

5. Heard both sides.

6. On the basis of the averments of both sides the following issues are framed:-

1. Whether the bills issued by the Respondents for the month of April,2018 is liable to be rectified and the excess bill if any required to be adjusted? and
2. To what relief?

**Issue No.1**

7. Admittedly the Appellant i.e. Jawaharlal Nehru College, Vemulawada who is being represented by its Administrative Officer namely Srikanth, are allotted the service connection No. 20201 06138 for their guest house and that the said guest house consists of two rooms with two tube lights, two bulbs and three fans and that in the month of April,2018, the said service connection was issued a bill for an amount of Rs 1,60,634/- showing the consumption of units as 16060. The Appellant contended that the said consumption of 16060 units is not only abnormal but arbitrary for a single month. They pointed out that the records submitted by themselves and the Respondents clearly show that their average consumption is very minimal and as such the question of their consuming such huge amounts of units in a single month does not arise. They claimed that the said billing done for the month of April,2018 is faulty and hence requires to be rectified and the excess bill given by them requires to be adjusted.

8. The Respondents on the other hand contended that on the contentions of the Appellant that the billing for the month of April,2018 is faulty as the meter is

faulty, they have sent the meter to the Sircilla CESS lab for examining the meter and the said lab gave the finding that there was no fault with the meter. The Appellant objected to the said finding as such the meter was again sent to Karimnagar Vidyut Mandali Lab for examination and the said meter was examined in the presence of the Appellant and found that the meter was normal and was functioning properly. They pointed out that the billing for the month of April,2018 as issued to the Appellant was in accordance with the reading of the units on the meter to the service connection of the Appellant and that the said reading was absolutely as per the consumption of the Appellant and hence does not require to be rectified or revised.

9. A perusal of the records furnished by both the Appellant and the Respondents clearly show that the consumption statement of the Appellant through out the year is much less than the consumption of the Appellant in the month of April,2018 but the contentions of the Respondents also show that they have verified the meter in the labs and finding given by the said labs show that the meter was normal and functioning properly.

10. In other words the contention of the Appellant is that the meter reading for the month of April,2018 was exorbitant due to the faulty meter for their service connection bearing No. SC 20201 06138 and the same is denied by the Respondents. It is not denied by the Appellant that the meter pertaining to their service connection was inspected both at the CESS lab at Sircilla and also at Karimnagar and both the said labs have given a finding that the meter was normal and was not faulty. The statement of consumption of the units for the said service connection nowhere showed in the previous months that the consumption for single month was to and extent of 16060. In fact the maximum units consumed by the Appellant as per the consumption statement filed by both the Appellant and the Respondents is 100 units, but a scrutiny of the said consumption statement of the Appellant curiously shows the consumption as 2 units, 1 unit, 0 units, 14 units, 40 units, 24 units, 100 units etc. which means the pattern of consumption of the units by the Appellant is not consisted because their lowest consumption is 1 unit and the maximum is 100 units and the Appellant have not explained any reason as to how the consumption can fluctuate from 1 unit to 100 units in different months. The records show that till the billing was done for the month of April,2018 the Appellants never complained against their meter in spite of the fact that the consumption of their units abnormally fluctuated from 1 unit to 100 units. As such in the face of the findings of the labs that the meter of

the Appellant was not faulty and in the face of the abnormally fluctuating the consumption units of the Appellant from 1 unit to 100 units, it can only concluded that it is not the fault of the meter showing the consumption as 16060 units in the month of April,2018 but obviously it was due to the faulty recording of the units consumed by the Appellant in the previous months which has come into the open while recording the units for the month of April,2018. In other words it can be concluded that the reading for the month of April,2018 includes the consumed units even in the previous months and that was the result of the negligence or connivance of the meter reading recorders which was not noticed by the higher officials of the Respondent department. The said fact that the Respondents were negligent and indifferent in their duties is obvious from the fact that notices were issued to the Appellant by different officials showing different amounts. And in view of the said discrepancies in the amount demanded by the Respondents under different notices, the learned CGRF rightly directed the Respondents to bill the amount demanded for the month of April,2018 proportionately for each month from the date of installation of the meter i.e from March,2014 to March,2018 and the same has been complied by the Respondents and hence an amount of Rs 27,379/- has already been withdrawn from the bill issued for the month of April,2018. As such the Appellants are liable to pay an amount of Rs 1,36,749/- as approved by MD/CESS Sircilla. Accordingly decides this issue.

#### **Issue No.2**

11. In the result the Appeal is accordingly disposed but in view of the huge amounts involved and to avoid burden to the Appellant, he is at liberty to pay the amount in 10 monthly instalments or in one lump sum.

12. 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 Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this the 11th day of March, 2019.

Sd/-

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. Sri. M. Srikanth, Jawaharlal Nehru College, Vemulawada (M), Siricilla,  
Karimnagar - Dist. Cell: 9963647370

2. The AE/OP/Town/Vemulawada - 9440814075.

3. The ADE/OP/Vemulawada - 9490610236.

4. The AAO/ERO/Vemulawada - 9440814064.

5. The DE/OP/CESS-2/Sircilla - 9440814059.

**Copy to :**

6. The Chairperson, CGRF-I,TSNPDCI,Nakkalagutta, Hanamkonda, Warangal.

7. The Secretary, TSERC, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul,Hyd.