



VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

First Floor 33/11 kV substation, Hyderabad Boats Club Lane
Lumbini Park, Hyderabad - 500 063

Appeal No. 09 of 2018

Wednesday the Eighteenth Day of April 2018

:: Present:: **Sri. NAGARAJ NARAM**

Appeal preferred against Order Dt.16.12.2017 of CGRF in
C.G.No.799/2017-18/Habsiguda Circle

Between

Sri. S. Guruswami, # 201, Vijayasree Apartment,
Ashok Vihar II Colony, Opp- Pillar No: 195, Upperpally,
Hyderabad – 500 048.
Ph. No – 9949 709 266.

... Appellant

AND

- 1.The Asst. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Ghatkesar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
- 2.The Asst. Accounts Officer/ERO/Keesara/ TSSPDCL/RR District.
- 3.The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Keesara/TSSPDCL/RR District.
- 4.The Superintending Engineer/Op/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/RR District.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 29.01.2018, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 27.03.2018 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. S. Guruswami- Appellant and Sri. M.V.Ramana Reddy – ADE / OP / Ghatkesar and Sri. B. Sakhru, AAO / ERO / Keesara for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both the parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

The appeal has been preferred by the above named appellant questioning the docket order of the CGRF of TSSPDCL.

2. The appellant stated as below.

“a) For the month of October,2016, I had received the bill for Rs 5616.00. As this was quite heavy and abnormal, I met the officials of the Assistant Engineer, Narapally, who had advised me to contact the Accounts Deptt. At Habsiguda,

as the billing was done by Accounts Deptt. When I contacted Accounts Dept. I was directed to meet the Asst. Engineer, Narapally. With great efforts, I could meet the Asst. Engineer directly, who, in turn, advised me that the meter was stuck up and he received information to that effect and I was asked to make payment and the meter would be replaced without any charge and the amount paid by me would be adjusted subsequently as per some formula and if the payment was not made the electricity supply would be disconnected. To avoid disconnection, I made the payment. I was waiting for the replacement of the meter. To my utter dismay, I again received the bill for the month of November, 2016 for Rs 5591.00 and again I met the Asst. Engineer who informed me that due to non-availability of meter replacement could not be made and I was advised to make payment of this bills paid by me for October, and November, 2016 would be given credit in the subsequent months. Accordingly, I had paid this bill amount also hoping for the best. While the meter was replaced I was seeing the subsequent months bills where to my surprise no adjustment of the excess amount paid as above has been done nor given any credit.

b) Subsequently, I had visited the Asst. Engineer office time and again, without much success. No other official was accepting my letter nor have been giving any information except that I should meet the Asst. Engineer directly to represent my case. This has been going on and in the meantime the Asst. Engineer was transferred and I had to meet the new Asst. Engineer and represented my case in the presence of Asst. Divisional Engineer, Ghatkesar who was to my luck present Asst. Engineer Officer at Narapally, who in turn advised the Asst. Engineer to process my case and I was assured that the matter would be examined favourably. As nothing further happened, one day I waited at AE's office for hours together and got the matter processed finally and with that I had to visit ADE's and Ghatkesar and got it countersigned. After the countersignature, I had given the papers to the AAO/ERO, Habsiguda personally. Initially, the AAO refused to accept due to the delay. But, I had represented that I had been visiting the AE office personally since December, 2016 on various dates and the delay was not on my part and there was no limitation period as such for this purpose.

c) Now, the matter stands at this juncture and I have been visiting AAO / ERO Office. I am a senior citizen and I certainly need a better treatment. I am

enclosing all the details in the hope that my grievance would get attention for redressal. In addition, I need to seek your kind attention for the following facts:

- i) Better to allot certain date and time for meeting the consumers at the AE's Office;
- ii) There should be a transparent formula as part of citizen charter in regard to disposal of 'stuck up' meter cases. I have never heard of 'Stuck up' meter in the city for several decades.
- iii) Senior citizens should be given some better treatment."

3. The CGRF has disposed of the complaint of the appellant originally with the following observation

"In view of the compliance report filed by AE / OP / Narapally vide Lr. No. 1059 / 17, dt. 13.12.2017 coupled with the statement of Sri. B. Sakru, AAO / ERO / Keesara before this forum dt.14.12.2017 when the Respondents are redress the grievance by revising the bill based on the AE / OP / Narapally vide Lr.No.385 / 17, dt. 27.07.2017 of October, 2017 an withdraw an amount of Rs. 4903/- and the same will be adjusted to the consumer dt.12.10.2017. Since the grievance of the consumer is already redressed by the Respondents by revising the bill and withdrawn an amount of Rs 4903/- towards excess bill and adjust the same to the consumer account. Hence, there is no need to pass any redressal order. Therefore, the complaint dt.08.11.2017 filed by the consumer is hereby closed by recording that the grievance of the consumer is already redressed after filing of the complaint and before date of hearing itself.

4. Now the issue that arises for consideration is whether the appellant consumer is entitled to an relief if so to what extent.

5. The appeal is considered on the following lines.

1. **Nature of dispute:** The dispute is of billing higher average units adopted by the DISCOM for the service connection no 1637 00177 for the months of Oct and Nov 2016. The appellant pleaded that due to meter was struck up, average units adopted and billed for Rs 5616 and Rs 5591 for the months of Oct and Nov'2016 respectively, are on the higher side.

2. **CGRF direction:** Based on the revision of bills by the respondents, withdrawing Rs 4903/-, the CGRF held that there is no need to pass any redressal order further.
3. The withdrawn amount of Rs.4903/- was based on revision of bills taking average units of 450 Units for each month. The Appellant claimed that it is unjustified and pleaded for further relaxation.
4. **The GTCS clause 7.5.1.4.1** mandates procedure to be followed for computation of the assessed units, when the meter becomes defective, which is reproduced here under.

“The number of units to be billed during the period in which the meter ceased to function or became defective, shall be determined by taking the average of the electricity supplied during the preceding three billing cycles to the billing cycle in which the said meter ceased to function or became defective provided that the condition with regard to use of electricity during the said three billing cycles were not different from those which prevailed during the period in which the meter ceased to function or became defective”.

5. As per the above said clause, the units consumed in the preceding three billing cycles were 159, 256 & 147 units i.e, for the months of Sep, Aug and July' 2017, as per the EBS record submitted by the respondents. Hence the average of these units $159+256+147$ divided by 3 is equal to 188 units.
 6. The AE / Operation/ Narapally, vide Lr. No. 385, Dt: 27/07/2017 though proposed the above said average units of 188 Units for the disputed billing months, it was not accounted so far.
6. I have heard the parties concerned. During the course of hearing, It has been stated the consumption is very low and that the amount raised too high. That at the hearing it has been pleaded that the consumption has not been correctly assessed. \more over there stood situation where the meter was struck up on two occasions. While partly the distribution company has sought to mitigate the grievance, It appears a perusal of the consumption of the consumer appellant is necessary. Accordingly the following table shows the same.

Month/Year	Status	Closing Reading	Units in kWh	Demand (Rs)
June/2017	01	1534	193	791.00
May/2017	03	1341	237	1340.66
Apr/2017	01	1104	175	919.00
Mar/2017	05	710	219	1235.00
Feb/2017	01	710	247	1385.00
Jan/2017	01	463	199	1122.00
Dec/2016	01	264	211	863.00
Nov/2016	04	53	722	5591.00
Oct/2016	02	597	722	5616.00
Sep/2016	01	597	159	653.00
Aug/2016	01	438	256	1543.00
Jul/2016	09	182	147	498.00
Jun/2016	04	35.77	899	6670.00
May/2016	02	7214	899	6655.40
July 2015 to April 2016	Not in use, No units consumed			
Jun/2015	01	7214	722	5155.29
May/2015	01	6492	1187	9136.16
Apr/2015	01	5305	789	5546.00
Mar/2015	01	4516	418	2456.00
Feb/2015	01	4098	363	2013.00
Jan/2015	01	3735	348	1901.00

7. After due examination of the above consumption pattern, I am of the view that the effective settlement could be made and the grievance mitigated if the consumption of the previous 3 months and post 3 months of the meter stuck up is considered duly giving benefit the matter being stuck up twice.

8. Therefore this authority is of the view the appellant's grievance is settled by arriving at the average number of units applying the above principle. The calculation is as below.

The healthy consumption previous 3 months and post 3 months of the meter struck up period i.e. Nov-Oct,2016 works out to 1219 units for 6 months. The monthly average units so arrived is 203 units per month.

The Licensee DISCOM and concerned officers shall revise the bills from the months in issue and collect the amount if any due, if excess amount is already collected the same may be adjusted by deducting the same in the subsequent bills.

9. 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 18th day of April, 2018.

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN I/c

Copy sent to

1. Sri. S. Guruswami, # 201, Vijayasree Apartment, Ashok Vihar II Colony, Opp- Pillar No: 195, Upperpally, Hyderabad – 500 048. Ph. No – 9949 709 266.
2. The Asst. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Ghatkesar/TSSPDCL/RR District.
3. The Asst. Accounts Officer/ERO/Keesara/ TSSPDCL/RR District.
4. The Divisional Engineer/Operation/Keesara/TSSPDCL/RR District.
5. The Superintending Engineer/Op/Habsiguda Circle/TSSPDCL/RR District.

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.