### BEFORE THE FORUM

## FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES

## IN SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED TIRUPATI

# On this the day of 11<sup>th</sup> June 2018 In C.G. No: 303/2017-18/Nellore Circle

#### Present

Sri. A. Jagadeesh Chandra Rao Sri. A. Sreenivasulu Reddy

Sri. D. Subba Rao

Sri. Dr. R. Surendra Kumar

Chairperson

Member (Finance) Member (Technical)

**Independent Member** 

Between

Sri. N.V. Prasad,

4-4-104,

Mukundapuram,

Nellore Dist.

Complainant

AND

1. Assistant Accounts officer/ERO/Nellore Town 2

2. Assistant Engineer/O/Stonehousepet

3. Assistant Divisional Engineer/O/Nellore Town 2

4. Divisional Engineer/O/Nellore

\*\*\*\*

Respondents

### ORDER

- 1. The case of the complainant is that he is tenant of the premises since 2003. He used to pay electricity consumption charges ranging between Rs.800/- to Rs.3,000/- per month since 2003 and never exceeded Rs.3,000/-. He received bill in the month of Oct' 2007 for a sum of Rs.10,348/-. He never consumed 1274 units at any month. Though he made several representations, none were considered.
- 2. Divisional Engineer i.e. Respondent No.4 filed written submissions stating that on receipt of complaint from the complainant, staff went to the premises and found the meter was correct and same was informed to the consumer. At the request of the consumer the meter was sent for testing and new meter installed. The meter was tested on 25.01.2018 and delay was occurred due to absence of consumer for testing. The test results are found satisfactory. The complainant was utilizing a connected load of 3 KW though his contracted load is one KW only. So a notice was issued for regularization of additional load.

3. Respondents No.1& 2 also filed written statements on similar lines.

C.G.No:303/2017-18/Nellore Circle

- 4. Personal hearing was held on 16.05.2018. Complainant and respondents were present and reiterated the same facts that were mentioned in their pleadings.
- 5. The point for determination is whether issuing of bill for 1274 units in the month of Dec'2017 is erroneous and liable to be revised?

The contention of the complainant is that the consumption pattern for the last several years clearly shows that he never paid more than Rs.3,000/- at any time. The meter was tested in his absence. No reliance can be placed on the alleged testing of the meter. His consumption pattern may be taken into consideration for issuing of the disputed bill.

The contention of the respondents is that when consumer disputed the meter healthiness, the meter was sent for testing and found that it was healthy. Son of the complainant informed that complainant was not available and the meter can be tested in his absence. So the test was carried out and there was no need to revise the bill as the meter was found healthy.

Where there is a dispute in respect of recording of consumption by the meter, the Forum is competent to decide the disputed question as per the provisions of 7.3.6 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply. Relying upon the above provision, the account statement of the consumer from Jan'2016 to Jun'2018 was obtained and verified. As could be seen from the consumption pattern of the complainant from Jan'2016 to May'2018, it is observed that the consumption varies from 164 to 634 units except in the month of Dec'2017 (1274 Units). Though the meter test results shows that meter is healthy, the pattern of consumption recorded for the last two years shows that the complainant availed consumption of electricity to a maximum of 635 units except in the above said month. Testing of the meter is only one of the parameters to determine the consumption of the meter and it cannot be taken as the sole criteria to determine the consumption. Sometimes there is possibility of jumping of digits due to voltage fluctuations and other factors. Taking the consumption pattern of the complainant for the last 2 years into account the recording of 1274 units in the month of Dec'2017 is on high side and the same can be rectified or adjusted as per the provisions of Clause No. 7.5.1.4.1 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply. The consumption for the months of Sep'17 to Nov'2017 is 442, 462 and 398 respectively. The average consumption for the preceding three months is 434 units (442+462+398=1302/3). Hence the excess units of 840 is liable to be withdrawn and respondents are entitled to collect CC charges for

- 434 units only and the excess bill raised for 840 units is liable to be withdrawn. Thus point is answered
- 6. In the result, the respondents are directed to revise and issue bills for 434 units for Dec'2017. The excess amount collected from the complainant shall be adjusted in future bills. Accordingly the complaint is disposed off in favour of the complainant.

If aggrieved by this order, the complainant may represent to the Vidyut Ombudsman, Andhra Pradesh, and Flat No: 401,4<sup>th</sup>Floor, Ashoka Chambers, Opposite to MLA Quarters, Adarsh Nagar, Hyderabad-500063, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

This order is passed on this, the 11th day of June 2018.

Sd/-

Sd/-

Sd/-

Sd/

Member (Finance)

Member (Technical)

Independent Member

Chairperson

**Forwarded By Orders** 

Secretary to the Forum

- Koine

To

The Complainant

The Respondents

Copy to the General Manager/CSC/Corporate Office/ Tirupati for pursuance in this matter. Copy to the Nodal Officer(Chief General Manager/Operation)/CGRF/APSPDCL/TPT Copy Submitted to the Vidyut Ombudsman, Andhra Pradesh ,Flat No:401 ,4th Floor, Ashoka Chambers, Opposite to MLA Quarters , Adarsh Nagar,Hyderabad-500063. Copy Submitted to the Secretary, APERC,11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad-500 004.