

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

**On this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of June' 2020**  
**C.G.No:387/2018-19/Guntur Circle**

**Present**

**Sri. Dr. A. Jagadeesh Chandra Rao**  
**Sri. Dr. R. Surendra Kumar**

**Chairperson**  
**Independent Member**

***Between***

Zubeda Begum,  
W/o. Dr. Haq,  
Kakumanuvaripalem,  
Bapatla,  
Guntur -Dist

Complainant

**AND**

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Bapatla
2. Assistant Executive Engineer/O/Bapatla Town
3. Deputy Executive Engineer/O/Bapatla
4. Executive Engineer/O/Bapatla

Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

**ORDER**

1. The case of the complainant is that they have received wrong bill and requested to revise the bill.
2. Respondent No.1 alone filed written submission stating that the service connection was released in Cat-II Sub Cat-I on 27.12.2014 having contracted load of 2 KW. The service was billed with IRDA port (Scanning) since April'2018 till January'2019 as per data sheet. The meter was changed on 06.02.2019 with final reading 17841 units and billed with huge amount of Rs.94,130/- for 9216 units with IRDA meter with manual billing. Consumer applied for challenge test and result is declared as meter working normally and recommended for accumulated consumption apportioned for last 5 years. Consumer approached the office and requested to arrange normal bill since her consumption never exceeded 200 units and unable to pay huge amount. They made revision of bill for 5 years as per challenge test recommendation and withdrawn an amount of Rs.12,317/- vide credit RJ No.39/03-2019 but consumer represented that she is not in a position to pay that amount.

**DESPATCHED**

**DATE 10/6**

3. Personal hearing through video conferencing was conducted on 17.10.2019 at 11.00 A.M. .Since both parties reiterated their contentions, respondents are directed to inspect the premises and file report.
4. All the respondents No. 1 to 4 filed another written submission jointly stating similar facts that were mentioned in the written submission of respondent No. 1 and in addition to it, they stated that DEE/O/ Bapatla inspected the premises on 17.10.2019. Supply is used for the purpose of welding shop with a connected load of 7 KVA, but as per recorded MD in meter maximum is 9 KVA due to non installation of capacitors and instructed the consumer to fix them immediately. Consumer paid additional load deposits for 9 KW and the total contracted load is 11 KW.
5. The point for determination is whether the bill issued for 9226 units in the month of February'2019 is liable to be withdrawn?

According to respondents the service was billed with IRDA port (Scanning) from April'18 to January'19. The meter was changed on 06.02.2019 on the complaint of the consumer that she received a bill for 9216 units for an amount of Rs. 94,130/- The meter was tested and report was given that meter is working normally. They recommended for apportion of accumulated consumption for last 5 years. According to respondents they made a revision and withdrawn an amount of Rs.12,317/-. As per the directions of this forum, DEE/O/Bapatla inspected the premises on 17.10.2019 and found the connected load is 7 KVA but recorded MD in meter maximum is 9 KVA due to non installation of capacitors consumer paid additional deposits and contracted load is enhanced to 11 KW. The meter billing from January'16 to January'19 shows that the maximum units recorded in that period is only 268 units in the month of February '2016. So also the maximum consumption from April'2019 i.e. After change of the meter on 06.02.2019 to December '19 is 281 units in May'2019. The data sheet clearly shows that either before the change of the meter or subsequent to change of the meter, the maximum consumption of the consumer is only in between 268 and 281 units respectively. According to the respondents, the service was billed with IRDA port scanning since April'18. Respondents failed to state how they recommended for apportion of consumption for a period of 5 years when the service was billed with IRDA port scanning since April'18. Respondents also failed to state when the meter is good why a recommendation was made for apportion of consumption for a period of 5 years. Admittedly the shop is a welding shop with a connected load of 7 KVA with maximum RMD of 9 KW. It is an admitted fact that the meter will be tested in prescribed conditions in the laboratory. There is a possibility of sudden fluctuations in the meter due

to system disturbances, transporting to MRT Lab at Tenali from Bapatla. Apportioning of consumption for a period of 5 years is not correct and reasonable method for revising the bill when the consumer has not exceeded the consumption of 281 units per month over a period of 8 months after change of the meter. There is no change in consumption pattern for this service from January'16 to December'2019.

According to respondents meter reading was taken by scanning the meter from April'2018. The dispute arose at the time of recording the consumption in the meter during the month of February'2019. If there is any mistake in noting the consumption units in the meter this would have come to light when the meter reading was taken by way of scanning in the month of April'18 itself.

In view of the dispute between consumer and respondents in respect of recording of consumption of energy it is appropriate to refer Clause No.7.3.6 of GTCS which is as follows:

*“Where any difference of dispute arises as to where any meter fixed to a service to record the amount of energy supplied to a consumer is or is not correct, the matter shall be decided by the Forum for Redressal of consumer Grievances constituted in accordance with Section 42 (5) of the Act, on application by consumer”.*

In view of the above clause, the Forum is competent to decide the above said dispute. Hence the Forum is of the view that it is just and appropriate to presume the consumption of this service during the disputed month as 281 units in view of the maximum units recorded per month after change of meter is only 281 units.

6. In the result respondents are directed to issue revised bill for 281 units for the disputed month i.e. 03/2019 and withdraw the remaining amount within 15 days from the date of receipt of this order and submit compliance report within 15 days thereon.

If aggrieved by this order, the Complainant may represent to the **Vidyut Ombudsman, Andhra Pradesh**, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Sri Manjunatha Technical Services, Plot No:38, Adjacent to Kesineni Admin Office, Sri Ramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-520008, within 30 days from the date of receipt of this order.

This order is passed on this, the day of 6<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

Sd/-  
**Independent Member**

Sd/-  
**Chairperson**

True Copy  
Member/Finance  
09/06/2020

To

The Complainant

The Respondents

Copy to the General Manager/CSC/Corporate Office/ Tirupati for pursuance in this matter.

Copy to the Nodal Officer (Executive Director/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, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad- 500 004.

Handwritten signature and date: 20/11/2018