

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

On this the 19th day of December 2013

In C.G.No: 143/ 2013-14/Vijayawada 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

Sri. K.S. R.Anjaneya Sharma
RR.Nagar,
Gunturuvari street,
Bhavanipuram Post,
Vijayawada City,
Krishna-Dist-521225

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-2/Vijayawada
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Bhavanipuram
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/D-1/Vijayawada
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Town-1/Vijayawada

Respondents

Sri. K.S. R.Anjaneya Sharma, resident of RR.Nagar, Gunturuvari street, Bhavanipuram Post, Vijayawada City, Krishna-Dist-521225 herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt:01-11-2013 filed in the Forum on dt:01-11-2013 under clause 5 (7) of APERC regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E. Act 2003 has stated that

1. He is having service connection No:259702 (distribution machine code No:6435433259702 in Bhavanipuram, Vijayawada and he is regular in paying the electricity consumption bills till today for the above service connection.

2. On 06-08-2013 the meter was strucked showing consumed units as 85 from 06-07-2013 to 06-08-2013. Then the employees of respondent fixed another new meter on 10-08-2013. The complainant paid the bill amount of Rs.925/- for the above 85 units.
3. After fixing the new meter, again a bill was sent to the complainant showing as the consumed units as 837 and charges are Rs.6369/- from July, 2013 to August 2013. But the complainant felt astonished how the said units of 837 were arrived though his consumption is not more than 659 units in peak summer vacation of 2013 and immediately the complainant approached the local fuse call office and asked about the difference and discrepancy in the above bills. But the officials of respondent gave evasive reply which is not satisfactory and then the complainant constrained to pay the said bill. Thereafter another bill was issued for August to September 2013 for 615 units (another 343 units were shown in the said bill) for Rs.426/-. All the above bills were paid by the complainant without prejudice to his rights and contentions through this complaint. But the meter now as on 19-09-2013 at 12:20 pm shows 505 units of consumption and in this juncture, how 615 units for the past month of August, 2013 were shown by the department.
4. It is further submitted that so the employee of the respondent wrongly calculated the consumed units and sent bills for excess amount instead of actual amount and collected the bills from the complainant on the pretext as if he is not paying the bills in time, and also warned that they will remove the service connection, without clarifying the above doubts and quarries of the complainant. Any how without prejudice to his rights and contentions the complainant paid all the bills as on today. But he seeks the clarification about the discrepancy in the above three bills, and he asked the respondent

about the said wrong bills, but the respondent paid deaf ear and did not clarify and satisfy this complainant.

5. Hence this complaint is filed requesting this honourable Forum to look into the matter and grievance of the complainant in the interest of justice and equity.
6. Therefore, the complainant prays that this honourable Forum may be pleased to pass orders in favour of the complainant against the respondent after due enquiry.
 - a. To direct the respondent to correct the bills and adjust the excess amount for the forth coming bill for the month of November, 2013.
 - b. To pay costs of this complaint;

AND

- c. For such other reliefs which are deemed just and necessary under the circumstances of the case.

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

The respondent-3 i.e. the Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/D-1/Vijayawada in his written submissions dt: 22-11-2013, received in the Forum on dt: 30-11-2013 stated that:

1. The complainant having service connection No:6435433259702 in R.R.Nagar section of Vijayawada town and is a regular in paying consumption charges. The bills are being issued to the consumer on the spot by the respondent representative, every month for the consumed units, based on the meter reading of the meter fixed to the said service connection. During the month of August 2013 when the respondents representative gone for issuing CC.Bills on 8-8-2013 has observed the meter was stuck up and issued bill with status "02" for an amount of Rs.6369/- for 837 units machine average

including shortfall units for July 2013 during which only 85 units were billed. Immediately on 10-08-2013 the defective meter has been replaced with new meter with old meter FR as 24421 and new meter IR is Zero. During the month of September 2013 the respondents representative has gone for issuing CC.Bill on 07-09-2013, with meter reading as 343 and issued bill for 615 units (machine average) with "04" starts (i.e. meter change).

2. When the complainant approached the office of the 2nd respondent (AAE/O/RR.NAGAR) it is explained him as follows. The consumption billed during July 2013, is very less since the meter is defective by that time. The bill for August 2013 was issued for 837 units, based on machine average consumption of 461 units P.M and shortfall of 376 units July 2013. The average consideration by the machine is $(85+656+643)/3$. But the actual average as per GTCS is $(656+643+546)/3 = 615$ units P.M and total units to be billed are 1145 units including shortfall of 530 units. During the September 2013 bill has been issued for machine average of 615 units with "04" status, but the consumption for 28 days in 343 units.
3. A data sheet showing the details is enclosed herewith. On verification, it is found that the less average and short billed August 2013 was compensated during September 2013 bill and needs no revision of CC.bill. But he did not satisfied with the explanation and approached the honourable Forum.

Findings of the Forum:

1. The complainant is a domestic consumer having service no:259702 at Vijayawada, Bhavanipuram and is paying the CC.Charges regularly, but the meter of the said service was fell ill noticed on 06-08-2013 and the same was replaced on 10-08-2013 by the respondents. The grievance of the complainant is that he received bill on high side for the said service for the month of

August 2013 for an amount of Rs.6369/- showing the consumption as 837 units though his maximum consumption even in peak summer had never crossed 659 units. Subsequently for the month of September 2013 he received bill for an amount of Rs.4261/- with consumption 615 units. Requested to direct the respondents to correct the bills and adjust the excess amount for the forth coming bills for the month of November 2013.

2. The respondent-3 i.e. the Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/D-1/ Vijayawada in his reply stated that on 08-08-2013 it was noticed that the meter was stuck up and bill was issued with status "02" for an amount of Rs.6369/- for the consumption of 837 units calculated by the billing machine on average basis and also included short fall for the month of July 2013 during which month the consumption was recorded as 85 units only due to meter stuck up. The defective meter was replaced on 10-08-2013 and the final reading of the old meter was 24421.
3. On 07-09-2013 the next bill was issued with the new meter reading was 343 and bill was issued for 615 units based on the machine average and with status "04". The complainant was explained about the procedure of billing as detailed here under. The consumption billed during July 2013, is very less since the meter is defective by that time. The bill for August 2013 was issued for 837 units, based on machine average consumption of 461 units P.M and shortfall of 376 units July 2013. The average consideration by the machine is $(85+656+643)/3$. But the actual average as per GTCS is $(656+643+546)/3 = 615$ units P.M and total units to be billed are 1145 units including shortfall of 530 units. During the September 2013 bill has been issued for machine average of 615 units with "04" status, but the

consumption for 28 days in 343 units and finally expressed that there is no need of revision of bill and requested the Forum to dismiss the case.

4. As stated by the respondent above and in accordance with the General Terms and Conditions of Supply clause 7.5.1.4.2 applicable in the cases of meter becoming defective, the consumption arrived by the respondents on average basis was 615 units per month and the same was applied for the month of July, August and September 2013.
5. A study of the consumption pattern of the service over a period of 5 years disclosed that the highest consumption in the month of July was 671 units in July 2009 and for August it was 655 units in 2009 and for September it was 628 units in 2010. The healthy meter recorded a consumption of 343 units from 10-08-2013 to 12-09-2013 i.e. for about one month.
6. As such the respondents shall have to revise the bills for the month of July, August and September 2013 duly considering the consumption as 615 units and adjust the payments if any found in excess on account of the said revision to the future bills of the service.

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

ORDER

The respondents are directed that they

1. shall revise the bills of the ScNo:6435433259702 issue for the consumptions months of July, August and September 2013 duly taking the consumption as 615 units per month and adjust the payments if any found in excess after the said revision to the future bills of the service within 15 days from the date of this order.

2. shall report compliance on the item-1 above of the order to the Forum within 21 days from the date of this order.

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 19th day of December 2013.

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 to the General Manager/ CSC/ Corporate office/ Tirupati for pursuance in this matter.