



**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

Tuesday the Twelfth Day of February 2019

**Appeal No. 49 of 2018**

Preferred against Order dt:20.11.2018 of CGRF in  
CG No. 530/2018-19 of Hyderabad South Circle

Between

Sri. Mohammed Abdul Naser, #16-10-182/E, Azeem Manzil, Malakpet,  
Hyderabad - 500 036. Cell: 8096206008.

... Appellant

**AND**

1. The AE/OP/Chaderghat/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
2. The ADE/OP/Chanchalguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The AAO/ERO/Chanchalguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The DE/OP/Asmangadh/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The SE/OP/Hyd. South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

... Respondents

The above appeal filed on 28.11.2018, coming up for final hearing before the Vidyut Ombudsman, Telangana State on 07.02.2019 at Hyderabad in the presence of Sri. Mohammed Abdul Naser - Appellant and Sri. J. Nanda - AAO/ERO/Chanchalguda and Sri. Ramachary - ADE/OP/Chanchalguda 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/Hyderabad South Circle vide CG No. 530/2018-19 dt.20.11.2018.

2. The averments made by the Appellant is that he has lodged a complaint before the CGRF seeking for revision of the bills, pertaining to his two service connections, by withdrawing the excess billed amount of Rs 61285/- and Rs 25,105/- respectively for the month of June,2018 stating that the said bills were excessively

issued to him on the ground that the bill reader has suppressed the actual meter readings while preparing the bills and the Hon'ble CGRF failed to appreciate his grievance and disposed his complaint. Hence aggrieved by the same the present Appeal is filed.

3. The Appellant avered that he has two service connections vide SC No. P2005451 and P2007477 in the premises bearing No. 16-10/182/E/1, Old Malakpet, Hyderabad and that in the month of June,2018 the Respondents levied a bill @ Rs 61,285/- and Rs 25,105/- respectively towards the said service connections and as such he approached the Respondents and found that the Respondents contended that the said bill pertaining to the suppressed readings on the bills issued by the meter reader. He stated that the said amount levied is heavy and is beyond his capacity apart from being abnormal and excess, as such sought for revision of the said bills and for issuance of fresh demand for payments towards the said two service connections respectively.

4. The Respondents through the Respondent No.3 AAO/ERO/Chanchalguda vide Lr.No.904 dt.04.12.2018 stated that due to suppress readings by the meter reader, the AE/OP and the ADE/OP recommended for revision of bills, subsequently the bills were revised and an amount of Rs 3171/- and Rs 4512/- were credited against the service connection Nos. P2005451 and P2007477.

The Respondent No.2 ADE/OP/Chanchalguda vide Lr.No. 1572 dt. NIL submitted the following written submissions:

That the SC No. P2005451 service was inspected by AE/OP/Chaderghat and found is in the name of Sri. Mohd Abdul Aleem at H.No.16-10-132/E/1, Old Malakpet, Chaderghat meter details and connected load as mentioned below:

Sl.No.	SC.No.	M.No.	CAP	Final Reading	Wattage in Kw
1.	P2005451	24965656	5-30A	9076	2.99

Sl.No.	Name of the equipment	Quantity	Wattage	Wattage in KW
1.	Tube Light	40 x6	240	0.24
2.	Fans	60X5	300	0.3
3.	AC	1400 X1	1400	1.4

4.	Fridge	180 x 1	180	0.18
5.	Geyser	2000 x 1	2000	2
6.	Mixer	150 x 1	150	0.15
Total			4270	4.27 KW

The SC No. P2005451, H.No.16-10-182/E/1, Old Malakpet, Chaderghat is in the name of Sri. Mohammed Abdul Aleem, the demand was raised in the month of June,2018 due to suppression of reading by meter reader. The raised consumption units was revised from Jan 2016 to June 2018 and credit the amount of Rs 3171/- in the month of June,2018.

Further the Respondent No.2 ADE/OP/Chanchalguda vide Lr.No. 1576 dt. NIL also submitted the following written submissions:

That the SC No. P2007477 service was inspected by AE/OP/Chaderghat and found is in the name of Sri. Mohd Abdul Aleem at H.No.16-10-132/E/1, Old Malakpet, Chaderghat meter details and connected load as mentioned below:

Sl.No.	SC.No.	M.No.	CAP	Final Reading	Wattage in Kw
1.	P2007477	19989445	5-30A	322215	2.12

Sl.No.	Name of the equipment	Quantity	Wattage	Wattage in KW
1.	Tube Light	40 x3	120	0.12
2.	Fans	60 x 3	180	0.18
3.	AC	1400 X1	1400	1.4
4.	Fridge	180 x 1	180	0.18
5.	Geyser	2000 x 1	2000	2
6.	Washing Machine	200 x 1	200	0.2
7.	Mixer	150 x 1	150	0.15
Total			4230	4.23 KW

The SC No. P2007477, H.No.16-10-182/E/1, Old Malakpet, Chaderghat is in the name of Sri. Mohammed Abdul Aleem, the demand was raised in the month of June,2016 due to suppression of reading by meter reader. The raised consumption units was revised from June 2016 to June 2018 and credit the amount of Rs 4512/- in the month of June,2018.

5. In view of the said reply submitted by the Respondents Appellant filed a rejoinder stating that the method of calculating the bills on his two service connections by the Respondents is defective and contended that in order to come to the correct assessment the Respondents ought to follow the procedure prescribed by him as follows:-

**Service connection No. P2007477**

That the Respondents in June,2018 bill claimed an amount of Rs 58,840/- in Service Connection No. P2007477 for total units of 6316 KWH towards suppressed reading for the period from May,2016 to June,2018 billing months i.e. for 25 months.

The calculation of 6316 KWH is as follows:

Closing reading in May,2016	15834 KWH
Closing reading in June,2018	29509 KWH
Difference	13675 KWH
LESS; Billed units	7359 KWH
Difference	6316 KWH

The total difference units of 6316 KWH divided into 25 months the average difference per month will work out to 253 KWH.

The Applicable tariff for LT I(B)(II) above 200 units/month during the period from May,2016 to June,2018 months is as follows:-

0-200 Units	-	Rs 5.00 per KWH
201-300 Units	-	Rs 7.20 per KWH

In view of the above, the calculation of difference of 253 KWH per month for 25 months will be as follows:-

200 KWH	X	Rs 5 per KWH	= Rs 1000/-
53 KWH	X	Rs 7.20 per KWH	= Rs 384/-
Total per month			= Rs 1,384/-
Rs 1,384 per month x 25 months			= Rs 36,600/-
Electricity Duty 6316 KWH X 0.06			= Rs 379/-
Total for 25 months			= Rs 34,979/-

That Rs 4512/-- is credited against their claim of Rs 58,840/- by the Respondents. Hence the net difference will be Rs 30,467/- i.e. Rs 34,979/- less 4,512/-.

Out of Rs 30,467/- Rs 15,000/- paid in July,2018. Hence, for balance Rs 15,467/- 24 monthly instalments may be granted.

#### **Service connection No. P 2005451**

That the Respondents in June,2018 bill claimed an amount of Rs 23,660/- in service connection No. P2005451 for total units of 2810 KWH towards suppressed reading for the period from May,2016 to June,2018 billing months i.e. for 25 months.

The calculation of 2810 KWH is as follows;-

Closing reading in May,2016	917 KWH
Closing reading in June,2018	6107 KWH
Difference	5190 KWH
LESS; Billed units	2380 KWH
Difference	2810 KWH

The total difference units of 2810 KWH divided into 25 months the average difference per month will work out to 112 KWH.

The Applicable tariff for LT I(B)(II) above 200 units/month during the period from May,2016 to June,2018 months is as follows:-

0-200 Units	-	Rs 3.30 per KWH
201-300 Units	-	Rs 4.30 per KWH

In view of the above, the calculation of difference of 112 KWH per month for 25 months will be as follows:-

100 KWH	X	Rs 3.30 per KWH	= Rs 330/-
12 KWH	X	Rs 4.30 per KWH	= Rs 52/-
Total per month			= Rs 382/-
Rs 382/- per month x 25 months			= Rs 9,550/-
Electricity Duty 2810 KWH X 0.06			= Rs 169/-
Total for 25 months			= Rs 9,719/-

That Rs 3,171/- is credited against their claim of Rs 23,660/- by the Respondents. Hence the net difference will be Rs 6,548/- i.e. Rs 9,719/- less 3,171/-.

Out of Rs 9,719/- Rs 10,000/- paid in July,2018. Hence, for balance credit of Rs 281/- to be refunded.

In view of the above stated facts, the Appellant pleaded to pass an order:-

Under Sub Section 3.35 of Regulation 3 of 2015 dt.03.10.2015:-

- a. To set aside the order dt.20.11.2018 passed by Respondent No.1 in CG No. 530 of 2018/19/Hyderabad South Circle.
- b. To set aside the claim of Rs 58,840/- of SC No. P2007477 pertaining to the period from May,2016 to June,2018.
- c. To set aside the claim of Rs 23,660/- of SC No. P2005451 pertaining to the period from May,2016 to June,2018.
- d. Any such other order or orders as may deem fit by the Hon'ble Vidyut Ombudsman in the circumstances of appeal, in the interest of justice and fair play.

6. Heard both sides.

7. On the basis of the above pleadings the following issues are framed:-

#### Issues

i. whether the procedure followed by the Respondents for recovering the suppressed bill is defective and hence requires to be revised and as such fresh bills are required to be issued? And

ii. To what relief?

## Issue No.1

8. Admittedly the Appellant Sri. Mohammed Abdul Naseer who preferred the present Appeal has two service connections to his credit vide SC No. P2005451 and P2007477 in his premises bearing H.No.16-18-182/E/1, Old Malakpet, Hyderabad and that the Respondents have issued two bills for the said two service connections respectively for the month of June,2018 @ Rs 61,285/- and Rs 25,105/- respectively. The contention of the Appellant is that the said bills issued by the Respondents is not only excessive but is also unreasonable and abnormal and as such requires to be revised and fresh bills to be issued. The Respondents on the other hand contended that originally the said bills were issued to the service connections of the Appellant in view of the fact that the actual readings of the meter were suppressed by the meter reader and hence bills for a lesser amount on the actual consumption of the Appellant were issued.

9. In other words though the Appellant contended that excess bills were issued and hence they required to be revised, he did not deny that the bills issued prior to the date of inspections were suppressed bills. As per the calculation of the Appellant the Respondents have taken the consumption of 24 months i.e. from June,2016 to June,2018 were taken into consideration for the purpose of calculation without specifying from which month the meter readings were suppressed. They also pointed out that while calculating the bills, the Respondents have to take into consideration the period for the service connection No. P2007477 as follows:-

Closing readings of the meter in May,2016	15834 KWH
Less (-) : Closing reading of the meter in June,2018	29509 KWH
	<hr/>
Amounting to	13675 KWH
Less (-): Billed units	7359 KWH
	<hr/>
Amounting to	6316 KWH
	<hr/>

As per the Appellant the amount that is arrived above i.e. 6316 KWH has to be divided into 25 months to take the average for one month and as such arrived at 253 KWH and calculated the value of the said 253 KWH as follows:-

0 to 200 Units @ Rs 5.00 per KWH = 1000/-

201 to 253 Units @ 7.20 per KWH = 384/-

and thus arrived at  $1000+384 = \text{Rs } 1384/-$  per month, and hence calculated for 25 months @ Rs 1384/- arriving at Rs 34,600/- and then added Electricity duty for 6316 KWH @ 0.06 amounting to Rs 379/- and contended that the total amount to be levied for his service connection for 25 months would be  $34600 + 379 = \text{Rs } 34979/-$  and claimed that the amount that should be levied by the Respondents for the service connection No. P2007477 should be Rs 34,979/- less the amount already paid i.e. Rs 4512 = Rs 30,467/- and further deduct Rs 15,000/- i.e. paid in July,2018 and hence the amount would be Rs 15,467/- and not Rs 25,105/-. The Appellant further contended that the calculations for the service connection No. P2005451 should also be calculated in the same manner and thus it is the Respondents who still have to refund Rs 281/- and hence sought for the revision of the bills apart from fresh bills.

10. But a perusal of the Tariff Order shows that the billing of the units consumed will differ from slab to slab i.e. 0 to 200 would be Rs 5/- per KWH, 201 to 300 would be Rs 7.20/- per KWH . As such the consumption of the Appellant has to be billed in accordance to the said slabs and so the billing would be different if the amount already paid out of the entire consumption is segregated and the slab system also changes i.e. if the difference between the consumed units from May,2016 to June,2018 is taken into consideration for the service connection No. P2007477 the consumption would be 13,675 KWH and so the Appellant has to pay for the slot in which 13675 KWH falls but if the amount already paid to the part of the said consumption is paid and is taken into consideration the said consumption would fall in a different slot and thus the billing amount for the said two calculations would be different and the same is not permitted under the Tariff Order. Hence the entire consumption of the Appellant i.e. 13675 KWH has to be taken into consideration and not the difference after the part payment i.e. 6316 KWH. As otherwise the said calculations would not be in accordance with the Tariff Orders. So also with regarding to the service connection No. P2005451. Hence concludes that the billing done by the Respondents is in accordance the Tariff Orders. Hence decides this issue against the Appellant.



## Issue No.2

11. In the result the Appeal is dismissed but the Respondents are directed to allow the Appellant to pay the amount due in 6 instalments in view of the hardship that would be suffered by the Appellant if he has to pay the entire lumpsum amount in one instalment.

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 12th day of February, 2019.

Sd/-

**Vidyut Ombudsman**

1. Sri. Mohammed Abdul Naser, #16-10-182/E, Azeem Manzil, Malakpet, Hyderabad - 500 036. Cell: 8096206008.
2. The AE/OP/Chaderghat/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
3. The ADE/OP/Chanchalguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
4. The AAO/ERO/Chanchalguda/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
5. The DE/OP/Asmangadh/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.
6. The SE/OP/Hyd. South Circle/TSSPDCL/Hyderabad.

### **Copy to :**

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