# <u>BEFORE THE FORUM</u> <u>FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES</u> <u>IN SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED</u> <u>TIRUPATI</u>

### On this the 26<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014

### In C.G.No:18/ 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

Sri T.Rami Reddy C/o Chinna Konda Reddy DNo:14-10-19, Sivalayam Street, Morispet Post, Tenali Town, Guntur-Dist-522202

And

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Tenali

2. Assistant Engineer/Operation/D-2/Tenali

Respondents

Complainant

3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/Operation/Town/Tenali

\*\*\*

Sri T.Rami Reddy, C/o Chinna Konda Reddy resident of DNo:14-10-19, Sivalayam Street, Morispet Post, Tenali Town, Guntur-Dist-522202 herein called the complainant, in his complaint dt:23-05-2014 filed in the Forum on dt:23-05-2014 under clause 5 (7) of APERC regulation 1/2004 read with section 42 (5) of I.E.Act 2003 has stated that

1. He is a domestic consumer at Morispet, Tenali with service Number:53491 and he received bill on high side for the said service and requested to revise the bill.

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

The respondent-1 i.e. the Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Tenali in his written submission dt:03-06-2014, received in this office on 06-06-2014 stated that:

 The SCNo.1211201053491 is being billed in D2 section, under L.Zone M2 group Category-I, 2<sup>nd</sup> spell and as per the said billing schedule the CC.bill for 10/13 was issued as hereunder and noticed that the meter of the service was stuck up.

Opening Reading	: 2340
Closing Reading	: 2340
Meter status	: Stuck-up (02)
Units-billed	: 93 units (as per Machine average)
Billed Date	: 17.10.2013
Amount of the bill	: Rs.273.00

2. In 11/13, the CC.bill was issued as hereunder,

Opening Reading	: 2340
Closing Reading	: 54 ( After Change of meter)
Meter status	: Meter Change (04)
Billed Date	: 16.11.2013
Units-billed	: 70 units (54 units + Machine average for the $MS$
	period up to date of meter change)
Amount of the bill	: Rs.232.00

3. After change of meter, the stuck-up meter was sent to MRT, and the AAE/LT meter MRT/Guntur vide his Lr.No.AAE/LTM/GNT/F Reading File/GNT lab/DNo.500/14 dt:4.2.14 (Copy submitted) has communicated the final readings of certain MS meters and requested to take necessary action, in which the final reading of the above service meter was furnished as 2714. As per the final reading furnished by the AE/LT meters, the short fall for MS period i.e. from 4/13 to 10/13 for 374 units from 1907 in 3/13 in

final reading 2714) duly averaging the short fall units of 374 for 7 months, has been raised 3/14 vide RJNo.133/3-2014 for an amount of Rs.1,464.00.

- On receipt of representation from the consumer, the AE/O/D2/Tenali recommended to revise the shortfall amount, average consumption from 8/12 1517.
- 5. Accordingly, the shortfall amount already included in CC.bills amounting to Rs.1464.00 has been revised to Rs.661.00 vide RJNo.90/5-14 and the consumer has paid an amount of Rs.953.00 on 23-5-14 including current month CC.bill and the present there are no arrears against this service.

#### **Findings of the Forum:**

- 1. The grievance of the complainant is that he received bill on high side all at once for his domestic service bearing No:53491 at Tenali which is unjust and requested for revision of bill.
- $\mathbf{2}$ . The respondent-1 i.e. the AAO/ERO/Tenali in his reply stated that for the month of 10/2013 the CC.bill for the service was issued for Rs.273/for 93 units and the status was shown as '02' stands for stuck-up and for the month of 11/2013 by which time the meter was changed there was 70 units consumption and the amount of bill was Rs.232/-. After change of the meter it was sent to MRT lab where the final reading of the meter was declared as 2714 and hence the shortfall was levied for of Rs.1464/through RJ.No:133/3-2014. On an amount recommendations of the AE/O/D-2/Tenali the bills were revised from 08/2012 on wards on average basis and amount of Rs.661/- was withdrawn and the balance amount of Rs.953/- was paid by the consumer on 23-05-2014 and there is no arrear pendency.

- 3. As could be seen from the account copy of the service the contracted load is 1 KW and supply released for domestic purpose.
- The said meter was in service since 08-09-2010 the date of supply till 12/2013 during which month the meter was replaced for the reason of stuck-up.
- 5. As per the MRT report the date of meter replacement was shown as 18-10-2013 with final reading 2714 where as the reading in the meter finally billed was 2340 only and hence billing of shortfall units i.e. the difference of the above two is 374 units and including the corresponding amount of Rs.1464/- against the service is quite in order.
- 6. But however the other point of consideration from the consumer side is billing of accumulated consumption all at once puts burden on the consumer and hence needs revision of bills over the period suitably based on the consumption pattern in the preceding months. The respondents action by apportioning the consumption from 08/2012 till 12/2013 and revising the bills is quite acceptable and also was accepted by the consumer who duly satisfying himself had paid the balance amount immediately and expressed his feelings through his letter dt:Nil and thus the grievance is resolved amicably.
- 7. The said meter was replaced under the plea of stuck-up (No display) but at the lab there was display in the meter, but there was considerable difference between the billed units and the final reading of the meter giving raise scope for suspicion on the staff connected with which should be avoided by random check of meters by the

superior officers before replacement and sending the same to the MRT lab along with meter change slips signed by them.

8. The lenient attitude of the officers concerned in the matter of deciding the condition of the meters given raise scope for comments adversely on their performance besides effecting the revenue of the licensee herein the APSPDCL.

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

## <u>ORDER</u>

The respondents are directed that they shall be cautious while deciding the status of a service and the meter condition before its replacement and signing the meter change slips before sending to the MRT lab for further course of action and avoid such postponement of revenue in future.

Accordingly the case is allowed in full 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  $26^{\text{th}}$  day of June 2014.

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.