

2. The monthly consumption for his above service normally was of the order of 180 to 190 units but in one month he received bill for 377 units for which he made a complaint in the office but was directed to complain in the office at Srinivasam.
3. He met the ADE ,concerned who inturn directed the Line man to replace the meter and the meter was replaced.
4. He was asked to pay the bill amount first and the bill will be revised at a later date and accordingly he paid the bill and the bill was revised subsequently.
5. In 7/2012, he received bill for Rs.1061/-,which he could not pay as he was on duty and he received bill for Rs.2918/- in the month of 8/2012.
6. He met the AAO/ERO in this regard for which he was replied that he had not paid the bill for 4th month of 2012 for which shown the receipt.
7. The meter reader could not generate the bill with the new meter and left his premises for which he again met the AE who inturn directed the Line man to see the meter and report for the reading .
8. Bill was issued for 517 units for two months on average basis.
9. Then he shown the payment receipts to the officer and asked for the reasons of the huge bill of Rs.1,051/-, he did not care for his request and gave reckless answer.
10. Requested for justice.

Notices were served upon the respondents duly enclosing a copy of complaint.

The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-II/Tirupati in his written submission dt:14-9-2012 received in this office on dt:14-09-2012 stated that

1. It was observed that an amount of Rs. 958/- was withdrawn in the month of 03/2012 as per the recommendations of the Additional Assistant Engineer/Operation/Korlagunta/Tirupati vide Lr.No.AE/Opn/Korlagunta/F.Doc/DNo:561/12, dt:07-03-2012.
2. On verification of the meter changed services during the month of 08/2012, it is observed that the bill was not issued and demand not raised during the month of 04/2012 and showed the status was **reading not furnished (08)**.
3. On the basis of the previous and after months of the meter changed, the shortfall demand raised for Rs. 1,051/- in the month of 08/2012.
4. On thorough verification of the records it was found that the withdrawl and raising of demand was not necessary.
5. Hence the demand raised for withdrawl amount of Rs.958/- vide RJ.No.002/09-2012 and the demand raised amount of Rs 1,051/- has been withdrawn vide RJNo. 003/09-2012.
6. The consumer was paid the amount accordingly and the closing balance as on 09/2012 was NIL.

Findings of the Forum:

1. The grievance of the complainant is revision of bill issued on high side without considering his payments in spite of his production of evidence.

2. Though the complainant mentioned that he met various officers several times, he could not produce any evidence to that effect.
3. But the meter of the service was replaced on 27-02-2012 as could be seen from the letter dated 07-03-2012 of the respondent-2 addressed to the respondent -1 where in it was also recommended for revision of bill taking 200 units as consumption on average basis for the month of 2/2012 in respect of the said service.
4. The final reading at the time of replacement of the meter on complaint was 7597.
5. The respondent-1, ie the AAO/ERO/Tirupati,Town-II, reported that an amount of Rs.958/- was with drawn in the month of 3/2012 as per the recommendations of the AE above and on verification of the meter changes during 8/2012, he observed that the bill was not raised and demand not issued for the month of 4/2012 for the service and the status was shown as **08** '*reading not furnished.*' The raising of demand for Rs.1,051/- was not necessary. He felt that both the withdrawl of Rs.958/- and raising of demand for Rs.1,051/-are done unnecessarily.
6. The accounts were adjusted accordingly through RJ. no.s 2/9-2012 and 3/9-2012.
7. The consumer duly accepting the above, paid the balance amounts accordingly and the balance as on 9/2012 was made Nil.
8. The total connected load of the complainant was 2.860 KW which includes one number Air conditioner. The consumption assessed as per the General Terms and Conditions of Supply, Annexure XII (II) applicable for domestic

services for the connected loads in case of non metering was arrived at 394 units a month. Hence, the consumption of 377 units in a month is not high for the said connected loads. The reader might have suppressed the consumption in the previous months as the consumption was low in the previous two months. The meter of the service was replaced but the reasons for replacement of the meter were also not recorded by the AE but recommended for revision of bill taking 200 units as average consumption for month. The said replacement of the meter as well as the revision of bill both were done needlessly in the light of the above observations.

9. The only point of consideration is the non-accounting of the payment made by the complainant and the delay in resolution of the problem with negligence as alleged by the complainant.

10. The complainant made the complaint on 03-09-2012 which was received by the respondent-1 on 6-9-2012 and the same was resolved by 14-09-2012, i.e. by the 6th day as against the specified period of 7 working days in accordance with the Guaranteed Standards of Performance.

11. As such there is no deficiency of service on the part of the respondents in this case and hence no compensation need to be awarded.

In view of the above, the Forum passed the following order.

ORDER

The respondents are directed to

1. Satisfy themselves before replacing any meter reported creeping by the consumers by taking the check reading and assessing the performance of the meter by physically counting the pulses with standard load and if there is any

ambiguity and non concurrence with the consumer's argument shall got tested the meter at MRT lab in the presence of the consumer duly collecting the necessary fees towards the said testing. Based on the test results only the bills shall be revised if necessary.

Accordingly the case is allowed and disposed off

If aggrieved by this order, the complainant may represent to the Vidyut Ombudsman, O/o the APERC, 5th floor, Singarenibhavan, Redhills, Hyderabad-500004, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Signed on this the 29th day of September 2012.

Sd/-
Member (Legal)

Sd/-
Member (C.A)

Sd/-
Member (Accounts)

Sd/-
Chairperson

Forwarded by Orders

Secretary to the Forum

To
The Complainant
The Respondents
Copy submitted to the Honourable Ombudsman, APERC, 5th floor, Singarenibhavan, Redhills, Hyderabad-500004.
Copy to the General Manager/CSC/Corporate office/Tirupati for pursuance in this matter.

Filename: Order.152
Directory: E:\CGRF Cases\Cases 2012-13\Tirupati\TPT 152
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\Administrator\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title:
Subject:
Author: CGRF
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 17/08/12 10:14:00 AM
Change Number: 1,575
Last Saved On: 29/09/12 6:05:00 PM
Last Saved By: CGRF
Total Editing Time: 705 Minutes
Last Printed On: 23/11/13 5:52:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 6
Number of Words: 1,176 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 6,704 (approx.)