



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 Seventeenth Day of February 2020

Appeal No. 36 of 2019-20

Preferred against Order dt.27.12.2019 of CGRF
in CG No.524/2019-20 of Hyderabad South Circle

Between

Smt. K.N.Rohit, #4-4-341/A, Sultan Bazar, Bank Street, Hyderabad - 500 001.
Cell No: 9849600033, 9849020116.

... Appellant

AND

1. The AE/OP/Sultan Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
2. The ADE/OP/Troop Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO//Sultan Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Begum Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Hyd.South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 18.01.2020, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 04.02.2020 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Vinay Rohit - On behalf of the Appellant and Sri. M. Sridhar - DE/OP/Begum Bazar, Sri. A. Venkatesh - AE/OP/Sultan Bazar, Sri. A. Laxmaiah - ADE/OP/Troop Bazar and Sri. K. Chandra Mohan - AAO/ERO-II/Sultan Bazar for the Respondents and having considered the record and submissions of both parties, the Vidyut Ombudsman passed the following;

AWARD

This is an Appeal against the orders of the CGRF, Hyderabad South Circle in CG No. 524/2019-20 dt.27.12.2019.

2. The Appellant stated that she has filed a complaint before the CGRF through her Grandson, Sri. Vinay Rohit on 22.11.2019 for cancellation of JE Debit

entry and revise the bills for the month of September'2019 for Rs 23,965/-. She claimed that in spite of her representation before the CGRF that they are having solar electrical meter in her name and as such there is not much electricity consumption in the month of September'2019 and that she has paid the bill in part i.e. Rs 7,000/- in the month of September'2019 and Rs 7,200/- in the month of October'2019, the CGRF failed to appreciate the same and found that there is no need to revise the bill and cancel the bill, as such aggrieved by the same the present Appeal is filed.

3. The Appellant stated that she is a Resident of H.No.4-4-341/A, Sultan Bazar, Bank Street, Hyderabad and that she has been allotted the service connection No. G3001094 and that her Grandson namely Vinay Rohit who is her representative filed a complaint before the CGRF on 22.11.2019 seeking for cancellation of JE Debit entry for the month of September'2019 for an amount of Rs 23,965/- on SC No. G3001094 as they have a solar electric meter and consumed very little supply of electricity. In view of the said demand for the month of September'2019, they have paid an amount of Rs 7000/- in the month of September'2019 and Rs 7,200/- in the month of October'2019, but the same was rejected by the CGRF in spite of their above contentions. They also contended that when her Grandson approached TSSPDCL, GTCS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar, Erragadda, Hyderabad, they informed him that they will look after into the matter and on the next day they decided in his absence that there was a mistake on the part of the meter reader and hence the meter readings generated Rs 23,965/-. They pointed out that their monthly reading was very meager and even for the month of Sep'2019 their consumption was only for Rs 199/- apart from the generated amount of Rs 23,965/-. They claimed that they are regularly paying the bills and the Respondents failed to explain to them how such a huge amount has arrived, and as such prayed that the said amount for the month of September'2019 i.e. Rs 23,965/- be cancelled and the statement be revised.

4. In view of the above averments by the Appellant the Respondent No.2 i.e. ADE/OP/Troop Bazar filed his written submissions as follows:-

The SC.No G3001094 check reading details were submitted to ERO-2/ Sultan Bazar as requested by ERO in the month of July-2019. Based on above, the debit JE's added in the month of Aug-2019 with an amount of Rs 28,425/- as the KWH export readings are less when compared with previous month readings of EBS which were very high as mentioned in AAO/ERO-2. In this connection, Sri K.N.Rohit,

H.No.4-4341/A, Bank Street, Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad filed a complaint in CGRF- II regarding rectification of excess bill issued to the SC.No G3001094, Cat-I for Rs 23,965/- in the month of Sep-2019.

As per MRI dump data, the check readings were correct. Based on above, the Chairperson of CGRF-II was given orders as "forum is agreed with contention of the Respondents that there is no need to revise the bill of the consumer for month of Sep-2019 and the respondents were highly raised demand vide JE debit for Rs 28,425/- in the month of Sep-2019 as the KWH export reading are less when compared with previous month reading. Hence the point is answered accordingly in favour of the Licensee and against the consumer".

5. The Respondent No.3, i.e. AAO/ERO-II/Sultan Bazar also filed his written submissions as follows:-

That the consumer of SC.No G3001094 is having a solar electric meter and in the month of August/2019, as per the net metered reading furnished by the AE, the debit JE was raised for and amount of Rs.28,425/-. For which the consumer has approached the CGRF-II by stating the reason "wrong and excess bill.'

Accordingly, the Hon'ble Chairperson of CGRF has instructed to submit the detailed report JE raised.As per the instruction, this office has submitted the detailed report as follow:

1. The consumer with SC.No G3001094 utilizing the net metering provision from 2018 onwards.
2. As per the TSSPDCL regulation, for every six months credit was given to the metering consumers as per the check reading provided by the concerned section officers.
3. In this case also, the check reading has been taken from the section officer in the month of July'2109. The check reading particulars are as follows.
4. As per the check readings, the export readings were less when compared with the previous months readings of EBS which were very high.
5. As per the check reading, it was observed that excess credit was given to the consumer.

Hence, the bill was revised from March'2018 to August'2019 and debit raised for the difference of units, the calculation sheet is as follows.

Period	Import	Export	
Aug/2019 mar/18	10655 570	4902 0	
difference	10085	4902	
Net units=import-export-5183 units average units per month=5183/18=287.94			
Slab	Rate	Units for 18 months	Amount for 18 months
0-200	5.00	3600(200*18)	18000.00
201-300	7.20	1583(87.94*18)	11397.60
			29397.60

CC charges for 18 months	29397.60
Customer charges(60*18)	1080.00
ED(5183*.06)	310.98
FSA	0.00
ADDL.Charges	0.00
Total	30788.58
Rounded off	30789.00
To be billed	30789.00
Already billed	2364.00
To be raised	28425.00

After considering all the calculations, the hon'ble chairperson of CGRF has instructed to revise the bill as per MRI dump data. By getting the MRI dumps data, the bill was revised for the revised for the period from jan/2019 to nov/2019 MRI dumps will be available only for one year.Hemcce the date has been taken from Jan 2019 onwards. Which implies more amount has to be raised when comparing with the amount arrived by taking the average units as calculated above.

Hence the hon'ble chairperson of CGRF has concluded the case as “there is no need to revise the bill of the consumer for the month of september/19 bill and the respondents were rightly raised the demand vide JE debit for Rs.28,425 in the month of september, 2019 as the KWH export readings are less when compared with previous

month readings. Consequently the complaint was disposed of by the Hon'ble Chairperson of CGRF.

Heard both sides.

Issues.

6. In the face of the above averments by both sides, the following issues are framed:-

1. Whether the Appellants are entitled for cancellation of the bill for an amount of Rs 23,965/- for the month of September'2019 on SC No. G3001094? And
2. To what relief?

Issue No.1

7. The evidence on record admittedly shows that the Appellant namely Smt. K.N.Rohit who is represented by her Grandson Sri. Vinay Rohit is admittedly a Resident of H.No.4-4-341/A, Sultan Bazar, Bank Street, Hyderabad and that they have been allotted the service connection No. G3001094. It is also not denied by the Respondents that the Appellant is having a solar power meter and that the regular consumption on the service connection of the Appellant for the month of September'2019 was only Rs 199/- but the bill for the month of September'2019 demanded a due for Rs 23,965/-.

8. The fact that the Appellant was paying the bills regularly for the service connection No. G3001094 and that she was having a solar power meter is not denied by the Respondents, they also did not denied the fact the bill for the month of September'2019 on the above service connection was Rs 199/- and the same showed an arrears of Rs 23,965/-. The Respondents contended that the debit JE was added in the month of August'2019 for an amount of Rs 28,425/- due to wrong readings issued by the previous meter reader. They claimed that a check reading was taken in the month of July'2019 and reconciled with the MRI dump data which was found to be tallying with each other. As such they found that the KWH Export readings are less when compared with the previous months readings and hence the same was rectified by raising the demand for Rs 28,425/-. They also claimed that the service connection No. G3001094 is billed under net metering provisions since 2018 and as per the

TSSPDCL Regulations the credit for every 6 months was given to net metering consumers as per the check readings provided by the concerned section officers.

9. The said contentions of both sides go to show that the service connection No. G30010094, is billing under net metering provision through solar power meters since 2018. The reading for such meters involves taking monthly readings in two ports, one is on the import side and second is on the export side in terms of all the parameters such as KVAH, KVA and KWH readings unlike normal meters which have only one port. The bill shall be issued to the consumers on net energy i.e. import units minus export units as per the Tariff Rates. During the month of August'2019 it was found that the KWH export reading is lesser than the previous KWH export reading i.e. the reading was 11055 and present reading was 4902. The periodical readings shows that the wrong readings were recorded in the export port right from the beginning and hence the bill was revised taking the present export reading which was also counter checked with the data retrieved through MRI(Meter Reading Instrument) and hence the bills were revised. The bill was revised from march/2018 to August/2019 and debit raised for the difference of units, the calculation sheet is as follows: _

Period	Import	Export	
Aug/2019 mar/18	10655 570	4902 0	
difference	10085	4902	
Net units=import-export-5183 units average units per month=5183/18=287.94			
Slab	Rate	Units for 18 months	Amount for 18 months
0-200	5.00	3600(200*18)	18000.00
201-300	7.20	1583(87.94*18)	11397.60
			29397.60

CC charges for 18 months	29397.60
Customer charges(60*18)	1080.00
ED(5183*.06)	310.98
FSA	0.00
ADDL.Charges	0.00

Total	30788.58
Rounded off	30789.00
To be billed	30789.00
Already billed	2364.00
To be raised	28425.00

10. The said evidence on record shows that though the Appellant who was allotted SC No. G3001094 was regularly paying the bills issued by the Respondents claiming to be the bills for consumption for the said period, the actual consumption of the Appellant was not correctly portrayed on the said bills due to the indifference of the meter reader and hence when the actual meter readings were reconciled with the MRI dump the original consumption of the Appellant has come to be displayed and as such the Appellant is liable to pay the actual/original consumption charges for the electricity consumed by her. As such the amount of Rs 23,965/- as claimed by the Respondents in the month of Sep'2019 is liable to be paid by the Appellant in spite of the fact that the said burden of paying the huge amount due to the negligence of the meter reader was on the shoulder of the Appellant, but admittedly there is no scope for either cancellation of the said bill for the month of September'2019 nor rectification of the said bills. Hence decides this issue against the Appellant.

Issue No.2

11. In the result, the Appeal is dismissed.

TYPED BY Office Executive cum Computer Operator, Corrected, Signed and Pronounced by me on this, the 17th day of February'2020.

Sd/-

Vidyut Ombudsman

1. Smt. K.N.Rohit, #4-4-341/A, Sultan Bazar, Bank Street,
Hyderabad - 500 001. Cell No: 9849600033, 9849020116
2. The AE/OP/Sultan Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The ADE/OP/Troop Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The AAO/ERO/Sultan Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The DE/OP/Begum Bazar/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
6. The SE/OP/Hyd.South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

Copy to :

7. The Chairperson, CGRF - GHA, TSSPDCL, GTS Colony, Vengal Rao Nagar,
Erragadda.
8. The Secretary, TSERC, 5th Floor Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapul, Hyd.