



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

Wednesday, the First Day of February 2017

Appeal No. 76 of 2016

Preferred against Order Dt. 21-11-2016 of CGRF In

CG.No: 436/2016-17 of Hyderabad North Circle

Between

Sri.K.Chandrasekar, Plot No:24, IOB colony, Trimulghery, Secunderabad-500 015
Cell No: 9848023797.

... Appellant

And

1. The ADE/OP/Lal bazar/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
2. The AAO/ERO/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
3. The DE/OP/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
4. The SE/OP/Hyd.North Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 27.12.2016 coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 25.01.2017 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. N. Phaneendra - on behalf of the Appellant and Sri. N. Sridhar - ADE/OP/Lal Bazar, Sri. G.V.N.L.Bhavani - AAO/ERO-VII/Bowenpally, Sri. D. Sudeep Reddy - AE/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 consumer of SC No. AZ036167. The Appellant claimed that even though there is no consumption of electricity beyond the use of two tube lights, the Respondents issued bills for the period from May,2016 to Sept,2016 in the range of Rs 2,900/- to Rs 3,200/-. He alleged that in the month of October,2016 a bill for Rs 3,163/- was issued by the Respondents for 13 units of consumption and sought revision of the excess bills through a complaint to CGRF.

2. The 2nd Respondent AAO/ERO/Bowenpally through a letter dt.22.10.2016 stated that the AE/OP/Lal Bazar furnished a check reading and informed that the consumption was correct and there was no discrepancy in the reading of the meter.

3. After hearing and on the basis of the material on record, the CGRF found that the bills were issued based on the consumption, there was no discrepancy in the reading of the meter and there were no excessive bills as claimed by the Appellant. Further the consumer was not ready to pay the CC bills issued to him and when he (Appellant) paid Rs 150/- for the meter testing, the meter was sent to the MRT lab on 5.7.2016 where it was found OK and that from June,2016 onwards, the Appellant has not been paying the bills and on the other hand filed the complaint and thus, the CGRF rejected the complaint through the impugned orders.

4. Aggrieved and not satisfied with the impugned orders, the Appellant preferred the present Appeal giving the details of excess consumption of units as follows:

S.no	Date	Month	Amount	Units
1	11/1/2016-10/2/2016	Jan-2016	Rs- 215.00	91 Units
2	10/2/2016-7/3/2016	Feb-2016	Rs- 91.00	44 Units
3	7/3/2016-5/4/2016	Mar-2016	Rs- 561.00	171 Units
4	5/4/2016-6/5/2016	Apr-2016	Rs- 993.00	220 Units
5	6/5/2016-8/6/2016	May-2016	Rs- 3,298.00	508 Units
6	8/6/2016-2/7/2016	Jun-2016	Rs- 2,964.00	52 Units
7	2/7/2016-4/8/2016	Jul-2016	Rs- 3,040.00	06 Units
8	4/8/2016-8/9/2016	Aug-2016	Rs- 2,964.00	16 Units
9	8/9/2016-8/10/2016	Sep-2016	Rs- 3,102.00	13 Units
10	8/10/2016-6/11/2016	Oct-2016	Rs- 3,225.00	13 Units
11	6/11/2016-10/12/2016	Nov-2016	Rs- 3,286.00	10 Units

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

6. On the basis of the record, the following issues arise for determination:

ISSUES

1. Whether there were excess CC bills as claimed by the Respondents?
2. Whether the excess billing showing huge amount as arrears is liable to be set aside?
3. Whether the impugned orders are liable to be set aside?

Issues 1 to 3

7. The Appellant claimed that there is lot of variation in the meter readings and in the month of May, the amount due was shown as Rs 3,298/-, in the month of June - Rs 2,964 and similarly in the month of July - Rs 3040/- and in August - Rs 2,964/- was shown as due representing the alleged consumption. The Appellant questioned the bill amounts and sought reduction of the bill amounts on the ground that he had only two tube lights for use and questioned the quantum of bills issued to him.

8. When the Appellant questioned the veracity of the bills, the MRT test was conducted and the meter was found working normally. Based on EBS data on consumption, the 1st Respondent ADE/OP/Lal Bazar filed the following statement regarding consumption which is as follows:

Month/Year	Closing reading	Units in kWh/MF	Demand	Collection	Arrears
Dec/2016	6093	10/1	61.00	0.00	3286.00
Nov/2016	6083	13/1	62.00	0.00	3225.00
Oct/2016	6070	13/1	61.00	0.00	3163.00
Sep/2016	6057	16/1	62.00	0.00	3102.00
Aug/2016	6041	6/1	76.00	0.00	3040.00
Jul/2016	6035	52/1	136.00	0.00	2964.00
Jun/2016	5983	508/1	3298.00	0.00	2828.00
May/2016	5475	220/1	1009.00	993.00	-470.00
Apr/2016	5255	171/1	561.00	561.00	-470.00
Mar/2016	5084	44/1	91.00	0.00	-470.00
Feb/2016	5040	91/1	215.00	215.00	-561.00
Jan/2016	4949	55/1	119.00	119.00	-561.00
Dec/2015	4894	71/1	186.00	597.00	-561.00

9. The claim of the Appellant that he has only two tube lights of connected load and questioned as to how he could get 500 units of consumption even in the face of test conducted on the meter at the MRT lab which revealed no defect in the meter is untenable. The huge bills shown by the Appellant as arrears in the table from Jan,2016 to Nov,2016(in para 4 supra) is only the cumulative amount for these eleven months totalling the amount due. It is not individual amount, but it is the cumulative amount shown in the table. The table for the months of Dec,2015 to Dec,2016 clearly shows that the Appellant stopped payment from June,2016 onwards, keeping the balance due as Rs 2,828/- which was being added to the current consumption bill for each month, which the Appellant misleadingly claimed that he was getting CC bill for Rs 2000/- and Rs 3000/-etc., which cannot be accepted.

10. The 2nd Respondent AAO/ERO/Bowenpally through letter dt.21.1.2017 stated that the meter was OK and the Appellant has to pay the bills from June,2016 till date to avoid disconnection of the service. The 1st Respondent/ADE/O/Lal bazar through his letter dt.24.1.2017 submitted a detailed report asserting that the bills issued to the service connection of the Appellant for the period from May,2015 to September,2016 was not excessive and not liable to be revised. The 2nd Respondent further claimed that as per the consumption recorded in the meter, the bills were being issued and at the request of the Appellant only, the meter was sent to the MRT lab, where it was found to be normal and sought rejection of the Appeal.

11. The CC bills were being issued by the Respondents to the Appellant. There is no discrepancy in the bills issued by the DISCOM. The Appellant, based on the bills issued for the consumption from time to time, claimed that there were huge bills which remained unpaid. A perusal of the record shows that there was no huge bills as alleged by the Appellant and on the other hand, the bills shown from Jan,2016 to Nov,2016 clearly show that in the amount column, the cumulative amount is shown and they do not show each month individual bills to the service connection. The exaggerated figures shown as representing the minimum consumed units by the Appellant is quite misleading. The total meter reading showing consumption each month is shown in the bills. There are no grounds to accept the claim of the Appellant about consumption of power and alleged excess bills. In the result, the Appeal is disposed of confirming the impugned orders. The issues are answered accordingly.

12. In the result the Appeal is disposed of holding :

1. That there was no excess billing as alleged by the Appellant and he is liable to pay the amount shown as due by the DISCOM.
2. The impugned orders are confirmed.

13. 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 CCO, Corrected, Signed and pronounced on this 1st day of February, 2017.

Sd/-

VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

1. Sri.K.Chandrasekhar, Plot No:24, IOB colony, Trimulgherry, Secunderabad-500 015. Cell No: 9848023797..
2. The ADE/OP/Lal bazar/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Bowenpally/TSSPDCL/Secunderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Hyd.North 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, Lakdikapool,Hyd.