

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

**On this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014**

**In C.G.No:06/ 2014-15/Guntur 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. SK. Chand Bee  
C/o Elahee Mineral Industries,  
Piduguralla Village, Post & Mandal,  
Guntur-Dist.522413

Complainant

***And***

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Piduguralla
2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/Town/Piduguralla
3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Piduguralla
4. Divisional Engineer/Operation/Macherla
6. Senior Accounts Officer/Operation/Guntur

Respondents

\*\*\*

Smt. SK. Chand Bee, C/o Elahee Mineral Industries, Piduguralla Village, Post & Mandal, Guntur-Dist.522413 herein called the complainant, in her complaint dt:06-05-2014 filed in the Forum on dt:06-05-2014 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 an industrial consumer with SCNo.8302 at Piduguralla for a load of 72.4HP the title M/s Eleahe Mineral Industries under LT-category-III since 30-03-2000 and never utilized power beyond the sanctioned load.

2. But the bills in respect of the above service for the months of 07/2011 and 08/2011 were issued under HT category and the total amount collected for the two months was about Rs.36,484/- and there was no response from the officers though represented several times and recently on 20-02-2014 addressed to the ADE/Opn/Piduguralla.
3. In response to the above she received a letter from the AAO/Sub-ERO/Piduguralla dt:02-04-2014 where in it was informed that the billing done under HT category for the months of 07 and 08/2011 is quite in order for the reason the MD exceeded and there is no provision of the revision of the bills.
4. Requested the Forum to revise the bills for the months of 7 and 8/2011 under LT category instead of HT already billed and render justice.

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

**The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Piduguralla in his written submission dt:16-05-2014, received in this office on 23-05-2014 stated that:**

1. The SCNo:1422100008302 of Piduguralla Town, stands in the name of Elahee Mineral Industries and released on 24-03-2000 under LT category-III with connected and contracted load of 72.41HP in Piduguralla Town section.

The CC.Bills issued in respect of SCNo.1422100008302 of Piduguralla town for the month of 07/2011 and 08/2011 are as follows.

| Sl.No. | Month   | Opening Reading | Closing Reading | Units | RMD   | Fixed Charges |
|--------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-------|-------|---------------|
| 1      | 2       | 3               | 4               | 5     | 6     | 7             |
| 2      | 07/2011 | 749148          | 752932          | 3784  | 72.40 | 18100         |
| 3      | 08/2011 | 752932          | 757871          | 4939  | 89.50 | 23375         |

2. As seen from the above it is evident that as per the recorded MD for the month of 07/2011 and 08/2011 the CC.bills were generated with fixed charges for Rs.18100/- and Rs.23375/- respectively. The RMD has exceeded with reference to his connected load of 72.41 HP so that the fixed charges were levied as per the tariff conditions of 2011-2012. The data sheet of ScNo.1422100008302 of Piduguralla town is herewith enclosed for ready reference please.

**Findings of the Forum:**

1. The complainant is an industrial consumer utilizing power for her industry supply availed under LT-category-III with a contracted load of 72.41HP at Piduguralla and the supply was being utilized since 03/2000 year. But she received bills for her service above under HT category-I for the months of 7 and 8/2011 and the reasons stated was that the RMD exceeded the limits of LT category-III and hence billing was done under HT. Her representations made in this regard were left unheard and finally she approached the Forum and requested for issuance of bills under LT –Category-III for the above 2 months for she never utilized the power crossing the LT limits and render justice.
2. The respondent -1 i.e. the AAO/ERO/Piduguralla in his reply stated that the contracted load of the service is 72.41HP and the supply was released on 24-03-2000 under LT-category-III. The RMD for the month of 07/2011 was 72.4KVA and for the month of 08/2011 it was 89.5KVA. As such the RMD in the above two months was exceeded with reference to the connected load of 72.41 HP and hence the fixed charges were levied in accordance with the tariff order 2011-12 applicable.

3. The clause 12.3.3 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply says as follows: *Cases where the total Connected Load is above 75 HP/56kW or Cases where the total connected load is above 150 HP under LT Category III (B). These services will be billed at the HT category I tariff rates from the consumption month in which the un-authorized additional load is detected till such additional load is removed and got inspected by the Designated officer of the Company.*
4. In this case the MD recorded for the month of 07/2011 was 72.4KVA with PF of 0.98 equivalent to 70.95KW (95HP) and in the month of 08/2011 it was 89.5KVA with a PF of 0.96 equivalent to 85.9KW (115HP).
5. As such in this case also the consumer in both the months exceeded the contracted load of 72.41HP and also 75HP violating the clause above and hence billing of the service under HT for the said two months is quite in order.
6. As per the tariff order 2011-12 applicable for the two months the demand charges are @ Rs.250/- per KVA and the energy charges are at Rs.3.52 per unit.
7. Hence the contention of the respondents that the service shall be billed under HT category-I for the said period is quite acceptable.
8. As such the request of the complainant for revision of the bill under LT-category-III instead of HT-I already billed cannot be considered and hence is set aside.

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

**ORDER**

“No separate order need to be issued”.

Accordingly the case is allowed and disposed off

If aggrieved by this order, the complainant may represent to the **Vidyut Ombudsman, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 33/11KV Sub-Station, Hyderabad Boat Club Lane, Lumbini Park, Hyderabad-500063**, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

Signed on this, the 25<sup>th</sup> day of June 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.