

BEFORE THE FORUM
FOR REDRESSAL OF CONSUMER GRIEVANCES
IN SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A.P LIMITED TIRUPATI
On this the 10th day of December 2019
C.G.No:132/2019-20/Tirupati Circle

Present

Sri. Dr. A. Jagadeesh Chandra Rao
Sri. D. Subba Rao
Sri. A. Ramdas
Sri. Dr. R. Surendra Kumar

Chairperson
Member (Technical)
Member (Finance)
Independent Member

Between

Malavathi,
Arror (V),
Irgulam (P),
Satyavedu (M)
Chittoor-Dist

Complainant

AND

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Nagalapuram,
2. Assistant Executive Engineer/O/Cherivi (SEZ)
3. Deputy Executive Engineer/O/Nagalapuram
4. Executive Engineer/O/Puttur

Respondents

ORDER

1. The case of the complainant is that the service Connection No.5331515000107 is in the name of his wife Malavathi. The complaint is presented stating that they have received abnormal bill and after repeated requests the meter was replaced after 6 months. Hence requested to revise the bill.
2. Respondent No. 4 filed written submission stating that the meter was sent for testing on the representation of the consumer and in turn AE/LT Meters reported that meter was in defective condition. AE/O/Cherivi recommended for revision of the bill from 07/2015 to 09/2017. An amount of Rs.5,171/- was deducted from the bill on spread over RJ No.18/07-2019.
3. Respondents No.1 and 3 also filed written submission on similar lines.
4. Personal hearing was conducted on 19.11.2019. Both parties reiterated their contentions.
5. The point for determination is whether the bill received in Oct'2017 for an amount of Rs.11,048/- is liable to be revised?

DESPATCHED

DATE

C.G.No.132/2019-20/Tirupati Circle

Page 1

Respondents themselves admitted that meter is defective. Respondent No.2 wrote a letter to JAO dt: 23.07.2019 stating that the spot billing reader entered fictitious reading from July'15. The meter reading entered in 09/2017 was with final reading of 2888 units with a high consumption of 1699 units. Hence requested to spread over the consumption from 07/2015. Basing on his recommendation the other respondent revised the bill. Admittedly the meter is found defective. The abnormal meter reading was recorded in October'17, but the meter was changed in March'19 only. Subsequent to the recording of 1699 units the meter reading in the month of November'17 is 42 units, zero(0) units in Decemebr'17, 39 units in January'2018 and 111 units in February'18. Subsequently zero (0) recording was shown for the months from March'18 to September'18. 20 units were shown in the month of October'18, 100 units in the month of January'19. Zero units consumption was shown in the months of November'18, December'18, February'19 and March'19. After change of the meter from April'19, May'19, June'19, July'19, August'19, September'19 and October'19 the consumption is 3 units and 2 units in July'19 and 6 units in November'19. So the consumption pattern even after change of the meter is taken into consideration, it is less than 10 units. The consumption from January'16 to December'16 also shows that except in 2 months i.e. in February'16 and April'16, it is more than 100 units and it is 59 units in June'16, in the other months the consumption is shown as 11 units in August'16, October'16 and zero units in 7 months.

So also the consumption from January'17 shows that prior to the recording of abnormal bill in October'17 the consumption is less than 25 units and only on two (2) occasions the consumption of units is more than 100 units in February'18 and January'19.

The contention of respondents that the consumption of 1699 units is due to accumulation of consumption and meter reader did not record the meter reading properly, hence they have recommended for revision of bill from July'15 is not supported by any other evidence. Once the meter was found defective, the consumption shown in that meter for the disputed bill cannot be taken into consideration. The contracted load is 0.26 KW only. Respondents also did not choose to furnish the actual connected load as on the date when the meter was found recording abnormal units of consumption. Hence the consumption has to be estimated basing on the available data with the Forum.

8. In view of the consumption of the complainant from 2016 it is very less as stated above. The consumption is estimated as per the provisions of Clause No.7.5.1.4.1 of General Terms and Conditions of Supply which is as follows:

“7.5.1.4.1: *The number of units to be billed during the period in which the meter ceased to function or became defective, shall be determined by taking the average of the electricity supplied during the preceding three billing cycles to the billing cycle in which the said meter ceased to function or became defective provided that the condition with regard to use of electricity during the said three billing cycles were not different from those which prevailed during the period in which the Meter ceased to function or became defective*”.

Relying on the above provision the consumption is estimated by taking the consumption from the preceding 3 months prior to recording of abnormal load in the month of October'17 are 15, 12 and 19 units in the months of July'17, August'17 and September'2017 respectively. The average consumption is estimated as 16 (46/3) units. Respondents are directed to calculate the consumption for the disputed month bill at 16 units only.

9. In the result respondents are directed to calculate the consumption of units by the complainant as 16 units for the disputed month of October'17 and revise the bill 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**, 3rd 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 10th December 2019.


Sd/-
Member (Technical)

Sd/-
Member (Finance)

Sd/-
Independent Member

Sd/-
Chairperson

Forwarded By Order


Secretary to the Forum

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 , 3rd Floor, Sri Manjunatha Technical Services, Plot No:38, Adjacent to Kesineni Admin Office, Sri Ramachandra Nagar, Mahanadu Road, Vijayawada-520008.

Copy Submitted to the Secretary, APERC,11-4-660, 4th Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad- 500 004.