

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

On this the 24th day of January 2014

In C.G.No: 154/ 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

Sri. Y.Balaraju
DNo:216, L S.Nagar,
Tirupati post,
Chittoor-Dist

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-1/Tirupati
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Rajivnagar
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/OSD-1/Tirupati

Respondents

* * *

Sri. Y.Balaraju, Resident of No:216, L S.Nagar, Tirupati post, Chittoor-Dist herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt:11-12-2013 filed in the Forum on dt:13-12-2013 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 a domestic consumer with ScNo:5523105000550 at plot No:216 LS.Nagar, Tirupati.
2. For his service above a bill was issued on 09-11-2013 with readings 5164 at which the meter was said to have been stuck up and was charged for 141 units and the bill was issued for an amount of Rs.512/- and the meter was replaced on 12-11-2013 with initial reading Zero.

3. He had paid the bill for Rs.512/- on 12-11-2013. On 08-12-2013 he received an other bill for 110 units consumption with new meter and 143 units with the old meter from reading 5164 to 5297 and the total consumption was shown as 243 units and the bill amount was Rs.1236/-.
4. It is not understood how the meter stuck-up at 5164 reading in the previous month had recorded upto 5297 reading.
5. The AE/Opn/Rajivnagar refused to receive his complaint and advised to pay the total bill amount.
6. It is unjust to consider the final reading of the meter has 5297(dt:12-11-2013) while it was stuck up at 5164 (dt:09-11-2013) reading itself in the previous month which indicates that the consumption is 133 units for 4 days where as their monthly consumption itself was about 130 to 150 units and hence issuance of bill for 243 units is erroneous.
7. Requested to revise the bill in view of the meter defective for which the consumers shall not be penalized.

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

The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-1/ Tirupati, in his written submissions dt: 24-12-2013, received in this office on dt: 30-12-2013 stated that:

1. The ScNo:550 of L.S.Nagar distribution meter was stuck-up 11/2013 average units as taken 141 units as per CBS system i.e.,

	<u>OR</u>	<u>CR</u>	<u>Units</u>
08/2013	4740	4871	131
09/2013	4871	4992	121
10/2013	4992	5164	172
Total			424 / 3 months = 141 units

2. 12/2013 meter was changed vide meter No:8809279, Dt:12-11-2013 with

FR	5297
As per bill FR	5164
Difference units	<u>133</u>
New meter units	<u>110</u>
Total units	243

3. The meter was stuck-up as per AE/R.nagar meter change slip No:613, Dt:12-11-2013.
4. Hence CC.bill need not be revised as the bill issued as per CBS system.

Findings of the Forum

1. The complainant is having a domestic service at L.S. Nagar, Tirupati for a contracted load of 1KW and the service was released during March 1996 in the name of Y.Balaraju under single phase. As per the billing data the meter of the service was fell sick in the month of 11/2013 at 5164 reading taken on 9-11-2013 and the meter was replaced on 12-11-2013. But at the time of replacement the final reading in the meter was 5297 which indicates that there is consumption of 133 units within 4 days which is abnormally high when compared to his normal monthly consumption of 130 to 150 units. He received bill for a consumption of 243 units in the month of December after replacement of the meter for an amount of Rs.1236/- which is on high side as felt by him.
2. The grievance of the complainant is that recording of a consumption of 133 units for 4 days by the removed meter which was declared stuck-up by the department is erroneous and unjust and hence the said bill needs revision and requested to revise the bill for the month of December 2013.
3. As could be seen from the account copy of the service the status of the service was shown as "02" (Stuck-up) in the month of 11/2013 and the reading was

shown as 5164 on 09-11-2013 and the said meter was replaced on 12-11-2013 as per the meter change slip and the final reading of the removed meter was 5297.

4. Had the meter fell sick and stuck up at the reading 5164 there shall not be any progression in the reading even on the next event of its reading, but it was shown as 5297 on 12-11-2013 i.e. within 4 days which indicates that the meter is working properly with progressive reading and not stuck-up, but the reader had mistook its performance while declaring its status on 09-11-2013. When there is a progressive consumption noticed at the time of replacement of the meter, the meter should not have been replaced as it was healthy.
5. It is felt that there was some error in taking the reading of the meter on 09-11-2013. As such it is necessary to bill the consumption what ever is recorded by the meter and hence billing of the consumption by the respondents duly considering the old meter consumption 133 units and the new meter consumption 110 units totaling to 243 units and the issuance of the bill accordingly by the respondents is quite in order.
6. The respondent-1 i.e. the AAO, ERO, T-1, Tirupati in his reply also stated the same and concluded that there is no need of revision of the bill as requested by the complainant.
7. The consumer in his further letter dt:21-12-2013 addressed to the Forum stated that he had paid the amount of Rs.1236/- towards the November bill and requested to adjust the amount to his future bills if any found paid excess if the Forum is of the opinion that the bill amount is on high side.
8. As such it is felt by the Forum that there is no need to revise the bill as requested by the consumer herein the complainant.

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

ORDER

The respondents are directed that before replacement of any meter they shall first ensure whether the meter is functioning normal or fell sick. They shall here afterwards not replace any meter which is functioning normally to avoid unnecessary expenditure on the licensee

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 24th day of January 2014.

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.