

**BEFORE THE FORUM FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
OF SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED
TIRUPATI**

This the 17th day of January 2013

C.G.No:290/2012-13/Guntur Circle

Present

***Sri K. Paul
Sri A.Venugopal
Sri T.Rajeswara Rao
(Vacant)***

***Chairperson
Member (Accounts)
Member (Legal)
Member (Consumer Affairs)***

Between

Sri. Md.Allabaksh
DNo:2-7-11/A
Jamedarpeta,
Bapatla Post and Mandal,
Guntur-Dist

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Bapatla
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Bapatla Town
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Bapatla
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Bapatla

Respondents

Sri. Md.Allabaksh resident of D.No:2-7-11/A, Jamedarpeta, Bapatla Post and Mandal, Guntur-Dist herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt:21-12-2012 filed in the Forum on dt:21-12-2012 under clause 5 (7) of APERC regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E.Act 2003 has stated that

1. The electrical service connection bearing SC.No.E-2516 stands in the name of Khamrunnisa at Jamedar peta of Bapatla.
2. For the above said service, the CC.Bill on 24-04-2012 was received for an amount of Rs.1014/- due to meter fault.

3. On 14-05-2012, he approached in person and represented the AE/Town /Bapatla and requested for reduction of the bill. But the AE did not rectify the bill and hence he paid Rs.194/-
4. He paid bills on average basis for the months of January, February and March 2012 the amounts of Rs.512/-, Rs.563/-, Rs.564/- respectively.
5. Requested to pay back the additional amounts of Rs.500/- he paid already.
6. In case of SC.No.E-3280, additional amount of Rs.85/- was collected for belated payment for the bill for the month of July 2012 and requested to pay back the additional amount.
7. For service number 35356 an amount of Rs.75/- was collected as fine for belated payment.

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

The respondents-2 i.e. the Assistant Engineer/Operation/Bapatla Town in his written submission dt:31-12-2012, received in this office on 05-01-2013 stated that:

1. Sri Md.Allabaksh is having SCNo:E-2516 of Bapatla the CC.bill issued to the consumer for the month of April-12, the consumption is 292 units an amounts of Rs.1014 after receiving the CC.bill. Any representation was not received from the consumer for revision of CC.bill in the month of April-12.
2. The consumption pattern of the service No. E-2516 is as follows:

Month	OMR	CMR	Consumption	Status
Jan-12	1093	1280	185	01
Feb-12	1280	1479	199	01
Mar-12	1479	1678	199	01
Apr-12	1678	1970	292	01

3. By observing the consumption pattern of the service No.2516 it is in 01 status. It is the actual consumption of the consumer and bill also issued under 01 status data sheet also enclosed for reference hence there is no need of the refund of the amount.
4. The service No. E-3280 FSA imposed vide Memo No:CGM (Fin)/GM (R)/SAO/AAO/JAO/HT/FNO/DNO:715/12 DATE:28-06-2012. After that first quarter of the FSA 2010 withdrawn and return to the consumer by obeying the court orders.
5. The service No:E-5356 billed for the month of August-12 bill issued on 20-08-2012 the disconnection date mentioned in CC.bill on 20-09-2012. But the consumer not paid the bill within due date of 19-09-2012 after that the service is in the defaulter list operated the D-list and disconnected the service on date:24-09-2012 with reading 320. after that the consumer was paid amount of Rs.154/- and reconnection fees Rs.75/- on 24-09-2012 vide PRNo:240912171004046-1388 as per the terms and conditions of tariff order reconnection fee imposed.
6. Further the complainant has stated that Sri late Kashim Kotha masijed road Jamenderpet 6th ward HNo:2-7-29/12 in front of the house 2 Nos paper flowers trees branch are through the compound wall north side. It is much unconvenience to me of my SCNo: E-1943, 1945 of Bapatla.
7. After verifying the complainant house found that the service barrel of SCNo:E1943, 1945 of E-Zone Bapatla passed over the neighbour house compound wall it was neighbours dispute. However the services wires are tighten.

The respondents-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Bapatla in his written submission dt:05-01-2013, received in this office on 07-01-2013 stated that:

1. The SC No: 3280, E-Zone, Bapatla the consumer was stated that though he had paid the bill with in the period. The late surcharge of Rs.85.10/- mentioned in CC.bill for the month of July 2012 and Rs.68.08/- mentioned in CC.Bill for the month of August 2012.
2. the amounts of Rs.85.10 and Rs.68.08 are pertaining to FSA for the year 2009-2010, raised in July 2012 and August 2012.
3. Later as per High Court orders the FSA of Rs.85.10 credited in the consumer account in July, 2012 and Rs.68.08 adjusted in CC.bill in the month of August, 2012.
4. Further it is to submit that the CC.bills issued to the consumer in respect of SCNo: 5356, E-Zone, Bapatla for the month of August 2012 on 20-08-2012.
5. The disconnection date mentioned in CC.Bill on 20-09-2012. But the consumer was paid amount of rs.154/- and reconnection fees Rs.75/0- on 24-09-2012 vide PRNo: 240912171004046 – 1388.
6. Payment amount of Rs.154/- is arrived below.

i.e. August 2012 bill	--	121
September 2012 bill	--	75
Total bill	--	196
Arrears balance	--	(-) 42
Total two months bills	--	154/-

7. Further it is submitted that the complainant has stated that he was come to ERO Office/Bapatla for average copy the SCNo: 2516, E-Zone, Bapatla.
8. The ERO staff members was demanded hundred rupees for account copy, in the absence of employee name and particulars, the undersigned enquired ERO staff members, the employees are replied that they had not determined hundred rupees from the consumer for the above said copy.

Findings of the Forum:

1. The grievance of the complainant comprises of multiple items not connected to him excepting the SCNo: E-2516 in which case he contended that the CC.bill for the said service issued on 24-04-2012 was on high side for an amount of Rs.1014/- and was not rectified and an amount of Rs.500/- was collected from him for billing his service on average basis. Requested for repayment of the said amount.
2. The respondents for the item above mentioned that the bills were issued for actual consumption recorded in the meter under status 01 (Normal) and hence there is no need for revision of the bill and refund of the amount.
3. But it is not understood why the meter of the said service was replaced in the month of 06/2012 though the meter is in good working condition and also in the same month the respondents billed only the units recorded by the meter (77), but not considered the final reading of the removed meter.
4. After replacement of the meter also many times the monthly consumption is shown as 100 units which appears to be far from the

actuals and hence the respondents shall have to take check reading of the service and billed accordingly.

5. All the balance items does not pertain to the complainant and there is no representation from the consent consumers in this regard and hence is not considered.

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

ORDER

The complainant's request for refund of the amount is not accepted and he is informed that the other items covered in his complainant shall be represented by the individuals having relevance with the services.

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 the 17th day of January 2013.

Sd/-
Member (Legal)

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.