

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:72/ 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. M.Rajeswara Rao,
DNo:32-26-16,
Karl Marx Road,
Machavaram Down Post,
Vijayawada city,
Krishna-Dist.

Complainant

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Town-I/Vijayawada
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Suryaraopet
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/C&O/Vijayawada

Respondents

* * *

Sri. M. Rajeswara Rao, DNo:32-26-16, Kari Karl Marx Road, Machavaram Down Post, Vijayawada city, Krishna-Dist, herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt:12-06-2013 filed in the Forum on dt:12-06-2013 under clause 5 (7) of APERC Regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E.Act 2003 has stated that

1. He had applied for new service connection for his house in the month of January 2012 and the service was released on 25-01-2013 with service number assigned as 163098 but the meter fixed was defective.
2. He took the matter to the notice of the department people several times who replied that the condition of the meter is to be decided by the meter reader but not the consumer.

3. Based on the report of the meter reader in the month of February, the meter was replaced and bill for the usage in total was issued for Rs.239/- and he paid the said amount on 18-03-2013.
4. Subsequently, in the month of March, the bill was issued for an amount of Rs.1183/-, for a consumption of 99 units but was taken as 288 units.
5. He represented the matter to the AE/Operation/Suryaraopeta on 26-03-2013 in writing and on line on 02-04-2013 but no action has been taken so far and the same amount was displayed in the bill for March-April.
6. He reminded the matter to the AE/Operation/Suryaraopeta on 24-04-2013 and he did not take any action and on the other hand in the bill for April-May, the same amount of bill was demanded.
7. Requested to revise the bills taking the consumption as 93 units for February-March, 66 units for March-April and 15 units for April-May upon which he can pay the bills.

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

The respondent-2 i.e. the Assistant Engineer/ Operation/ Suryaraopet in his written submission dt: 27-07-2013, received in the Forum on 06-08-2013 stated that:

1. Sri. M.Rajeswara Rao of SC No: 6424304163098 had represent to his office for replacement of his new service meter due to stuck up in the month of January 2013.
2. The defective meter was replaced on 20-20-2013 vide change slip no.50318/20-02-13. After replacement of the meter in March 2013, the meter reader issued the bill as per meter reading with meter change status as 04. The machine was taking the reading a 93 but issuing the bill for 288

units. The same was served to the consumer by the spot billing person. Sri. M.Rakeswara Rao has represent to this office as he had not utilised that much of units i.e. 288 and request for minimising of CC.bill for the month of Feb 2013 & March 2013.

3. He personally inspected the premises of Sri. M.Rajeswara Rao and found that the connected load is only 200W. Based on the connected load the bill was recommended for AAO/ERO for revision vide DNo:310/13 at 25-07-2013. After revision of CC.bill the revised bill was served to the consumer and the amounts are paid by the consumer vide PR.No:2277366, dt:25-07-2013.
4. Please consider the above said facts and the delay for revision of CC.bill only due to non receipt of notice no.72/2013-14 and he have taking charge as AAE on 17-05-2013 on transfer.

Findings of the Forum:

1. The grievance of the complainant is that he received bills on high side for his new service due to providing of defective meter and not replacing the same in time though represented several times to the AE concerned and the meter was not replaced though he identified its condition and informed the AE and the reply regard was the healthiness of the meter is to be decided by the meter reader. Requested to revise the bills so as to enable him to pay the CC.Charges.
2. The responent-2 i.e. the AE/Opn/Suryaraopet/Vijayawada replied that the complainant represented his office for replacement of the new service meter due to stuck up in the month of January 2013. The defective meter was replaced on 20-02-2013, but the month of March 2013 the bill was issued as per the meter reading with status '4' with consumption 90 units where as

the bill was generated for 288 units and the consumer requested for revision of the bill as his consumption is not that much.

3. Upon his inspection the respondent-2 noticed that the connected load of the service was 200 watts only. Based on which he recommended the AAO/ERO on 25-07-2013 to revise the bill.
4. The consumer duly convincing with the said revision paid the bill on 25-07-2013, for the delay of bill revision the respondent contents that he received the notice delayed.
5. Though the complainant mentioned that he had represented the matter earlier to the AE concerned herein the respondent-2 there is no evidence produced to that effect and hence the date of complaint made in the Forum by the complainant is taken for the purpose of assessing the delay in attending to the grievance.
6. The said service was released on 23-01-2013 for a contracted load of 2KW where as the respondent-2 says that the connected load is only 200 watts and there is a wide gap between the two.
7. The respondent inspected the premises only after the consumer approaching the Forum and recommended for bill revision and the consumer duly accepting the revision paid the amount on the same day i.e. 25-07-2013.
8. The respondent-2 should have recommended for the bill revision immediately on changing the meter in the month of February as it was done so the further revision for the month upto May could not have raised.
9. As per the account copy it is understood that the meter was replaced in the billing month of April 2013 for it was declared stuck up in March 2013

where as the respondents says that the meter was replaced in February 2013 itself which is not correct.

10. In accordance with the Guaranteed Standards of Performance defective meter shall be replaced within a period of 22 days maximum in towns and as such for the complaint made in January 2013 the respondent should have replace the meter atleast by the end of February 2013. If the said date of replacement i.e. 20-02-2013 is correct how the status was shown as stuck up in the month of March and replacement in the month of April.
11. However since the consumer satisfied and paid the bill amounts after the said revision it is felt by the Forum that there is no need to knowing to allow compensation for the delay.

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

ORDER

The respondents are directed that they shall be prompt in attending to the consumer complaints and resolve the problems within the time as scheduled in the Guaranteed Standards of Performance here afterwards.

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/-
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.