

BEFORE THE VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN

Present

K.Sanjeeva Rao Naidu
Vidyut Ombudsman

Dated: 20 -02-2013

Appeal No. 4 of 2013

Between

Dr.BBB Behera

58-1-77, Market Street

Jagannaickpur

Kakinada – 533 002., EG Dist.

... Appellant

And

1. Asst Engineer/Operation/D5/APEPDCL/Kakinada
2. Asst Divisional Engineer/Operation/ Town-II/APEPDCL/ Kakinada
3. Asst.Accounts Officer/ERO/APEPDCL/Town/Kakinada
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/ APEPDCL/ Kakinada

....Respondents

The appeal / representation filed on 28.12.2012 of the appellant has come up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman on 28.01.2013 at Viakhapatnam. Dr.B.B.B.Behera, appellant present and Sri B.V.V.S.G.Krishna, AE/O /D5/Kakinada, Sri P.Uma Maheswara Rao, Sr.Asst/ERO/Kakinada for respondents present and having stood over for consideration till this day, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed / issued the following :

AWARD

The appellant filed a complaint against the Respondents for Redressal of his Grievances and stated as hereunder:

“He has filed a complaint stating that abnormal CC bill was issued against his service and hence requested for justice.”

2. The 1st respondent has filed his written submissions as hereunder:

“The complainant Sri B.B.B.Behara registered online complaint on dt.25/08/12 vide RJY-24082012/9 regarding abnormal consumption in CC bill. The AE/O/D5/Kakinada inspected the premises and referred to MRT Lab Testing. The consumer paid challenging fees for MRT meter testing and the meter was tested on 11-09-12 by ADE/CT Meters Bommuru in the presence of the consumer. The consumer Dr B.B.B.Behara personally attended for MRT testing. As per the test results of ADE, CT Meters, Bommuru the results are found satisfactory. The consumer read the contents of the MRT Test Report and signed on the MRT Test Report. Again the consumer registered online complaint vide RJY30102012/4 Dt.30.10.12 in EPDCL website. The AE,D5 Kakinada replied to the online complaint that the meter was already tested and the meter working properly. And hence the CC bill amount is to be paid by the consumer.”

3. The 3rd respondent has filed his written submissions as hereunder:

“The above service CC bill was issued on 08/2012 for units 1365,

In view of the above, the AE/O/D5/Kakinada recommended for revision of CC bill for the period from 08/2011 to 12/2012. Based on the recommendation, the CC bill was revised and withdrawn for Rs.904/- vide RJ.No.32/11-12.”

4. After hearing both sides and after considering the material placed before the Forum, the Forum passed the impugned order as here under:

- **The grievance of complaint against Sc.No.8890, Market Street, Kakinada, E.G.Dist has been resolved duly apportioning the huge consumption for the period from August, 2011 to December, 2012 and withdrawn excess demand.**

Accordingly, CG.No.522/12-13 is disposed off.

5. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant preferred this appeal questioning the same that the bill for August 2012 is 1365 units with a load of 350 watts and it is un imaginable. It is also pointed out that when the average consumption during the last one year is 51 units and these facts are not considered by the Forum and the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

6. Now, the point for consideration is, whether the impugned order is liable to be modified. If so, in what manner?

7. The appellant present. Whereas, the respondents are represented by Sri B.V.V.S.G.Krishna, AE/O /D5/Kakinada, Sri P.Uma Maheswara Rao, Sr.Asst/ERO/Kakinada. and after receiving the written submissions of the respondent no.3.

8. In the written statement submitted by the respondents they have narrated the same grounds mentioned in the grounds informing that the meter was tested in the presence of the appellant and the perfect condition of the meter, etc. It is also mentioned that the consumer load may vary from time to time and he may use additional loads and remove the same at the time of inspection and there are no grounds to interfere with the impugned order and the appeal is liable to be dismissed.

9. Whereas, the appellant in his written submissions stated that the contracted load is 0.2KW or 200 Watts but not 2KW and his contention is that it cannot reach 1365 units even if the entire month with that capacity is used. If the consumption of all the months is taken into account it is less than 100 units and in the month of August 2012 is has recorded as 1365 units.

10. It is the contention that if the consumption is used in the entire month it cannot reach 1365 units. This shows it is due to defective recording or defective reading of the reader but not otherwise.

11. The only method available to resolve the dispute is to give a direction to the respondents to watch the recording for one week in a month and average consumption may be taken into account in a month and prepare the bill accordingly.

12. In the result, the appeal is disposed with a direction to the respondents to record the reading of the appellant for one week i.e., seven days and calculate the same for 30 days and prepare the bill for that month (i.e, August 2012) and collect the same and if the appellant has paid any excess amount, the same shall be adjusted in future bills of the appellant.

This order is corrected and signed on this day of 20TH February 2013

Sd/-
VIDYUT OMBUDSMAN