

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

On this the 21st day of September 2013

In C.G.No: 119/ 2013-14/Tirupati Circle

Present

Sri K. Paul

Sri A. Venugopal

Sri T. Rajeswara Rao

Sri A. Satish Kumar

Chairperson

Member (Accounts)

Member (Legal)

Member (Consumer Affairs)

Between

Smt. N.Kavitha

C/o Late N.Padmanabham

DNo:10-107,Nayibrahmana Colony

Chandragiri Post & Mandal,

Chittoor-Dist-517101.

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Chandragiri
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Chandragiri
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Chandragiri

Respondents

Smt. N.Kavitha, C/o Late N.Padmanabham resident of Nayibrahmana Colony, DNo:10-107, Chandragiri Post & Mandal, Chittoor-Dist-517101 herein called the complainant, in her complaint dt:22-07-2013 filed in the Forum on dt:22-07-2013 under clause 5 (7) of APERC regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E. Act 2003 has stated that

1. She is a domestic consumer at Nayibrahmana Colony, Chandragiri, of Chittoor-Dist.
2. For the service above the bills were received on high side irrelevant to their usage and the matter was reported to the AE and ADE,

Chandragiri on 13-06-2013 for which they replied that the high side billing is due to replacement of the meter.

3. She is paying the bills every month regularly.
4. Requested to examine the case and revise the bills.

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

The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/ Chandragiri, in his written submissions dt: 31-07-2013, received in this office on dt: 03-08-2013 stated that:

1. The complainant, Sri. N.Kavitha has complained in his notice that excess demand billed in respect of the service No:5424100007014 Chandragiri distribution, under category LT-I and requested to revise the bill.
2. In this connection it is to submit that on verification of office records it is noticed that as per instructions of DE/M&P/Tirupati back billing was done for suppressed consumption of 4093 units as per meter change slip in respect of service No.5424100007014 and demand was raised for Rs.23740/- vide RJ.No:27/4-2013.
3. On letter dt:30-07-2013 the DE/Rural/Tirupati instructed to revise the bill for a period 01/2012 to 05/2012 based on the connected load of the service, since the meter function treated as defective. Accordingly the bill was revised for Rs.207/- and also withdrawn of Rs.23533/- vide RJ.No:19/7-2013 and the same was also intimated to the consumer.
4. In turn, the consumer has given satisfactiion letter stating that he is ready to pay the amount of Rs.207/-.

5. In view of above, it is to submit that the consumer grievance may be treated as resolved amicably.

Findings of the Forum

1. The grievance of the complainant is that she received bill on high side disproportionate to their usage and requested to revise the bill.
2. The respondent-1 i.e. the AAO/ERO/Replied that he had verified the office records and noticed that the excess billing was done by billing the suppressed consumption of 4093 units as recommended by the DE/M&P/Tirupati and the demand was raised for Rs.23,740/- through RJ.No:27/4-2013, but subsequently as per the directions of the DE/Rural/Tirupati in his Memo dt:30-07-2013 the bill for the period 01/2012 to 05/2012 was revised based on the connected load of the service treating the meter functioning as defective an amount of Rs.23533/- was withdrawn and the consumer had to pay the balance amount of Rs.207/-. The complainant duly satisfying with the said revision given a letter to that effect.
3. As could be seen from the account copy of the service the meter was replaced in the billing month of 06/2012 for it was stuck up in the billing month of 05/2012. The final reading at the time of replacement of the meter was considered for billing and at a later date the meter was declared defective and withdrawn the amount.
4. None of the respondents made a mention of the testing of the meter for ensuring its healthiness or otherwise, but however the action of

the respondents in revising the consumer bill in accordance with the facts, they noticed with regards to the functioning of the meter and the connected load considered to be in order.

5. The respondents before raising any shortfall and including the demand shall first ensure the healthiness of the meter by performing challenge test if necessary in the presence of the consumer duly collecting the necessary charges.
6. Though the complainant was mentioned that the matter was earlier reported to the AE and the ADE, she could not produce any evidence to that effect and hence the date of complaint made in the Forum (22-07-2013) itself is taken as the date of complaint and the respondents took initiative and resolve the problem by 31-07-2013 i.e. with in a period of 7 days adhering the norms specified in the Guaranteed Standards of Performance.
7. As such there is no deficiency of service on the part of the respondents in this matter.

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

ORDER

The respondents are directed that they shall ensure the condition of the meter before raising such huge demands of shortfall for the consumption left accumulated and unbilled giving due weightage to the connected load and following the Clause No:7.5.1 of the General Terms and Conditions of Supply.

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 21st day of September 2013.

Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-	Sd/-
Member (Legal)	Member (C.A)	Member (Accounts)	Chairperson

Forwarded by Orders

Secretary to the Forum

To
The Complainant
The Respondents
Copy to the General Manager/ CSC/ Corporate office/ Tirupati for pursuance
in this matter.