

**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:273/2019-20/ Tirupati Circle**

**Present**

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

**Chairperson**  
**Independent Member**

***Between***

P. Janardhan Rao,  
9-104,  
Beside Vaartha Paper,  
Renigunta Road,  
Tirupati,  
Chittoor- Dist

**Complainant**

***AND***

1. Assistant Accounts officer/ERO/Tirupati Town  
2. Deputy Executive Engineer/O/Tirupati-2  
3. Executive Engineer/O/Tirupati Town

**Respondents**

\*\*\*\*\*

**ORDER**

1. The case of the complainant is that they are having service connection No. 5534501000343 under Category-III. They received a bill for Rs. 4,127/- in the month of August' 19 for Rs 10,941/- in September' 19, for Rs.8,352/ in the month of October' 19 and for Rs.2,430/- in the month of Nov'2019. Since they have not paid the bill for the month of September'2019, the service was disconnected. They received abnormal bill for September' 19 and October '19 and those bills may be revised.
2. Respondents No. 1 and 2 filed written submission stating that Sc. No. 5534503000343 was struck up during 09/2019 and it was billed under meter struck up status '02', meter was replaced during the same month and meter replacement was effected during next billing cycle. As per the existing billing process during struck up and the meter replacement billing cycles average units has to be billed for both September' 19 and October' 19. During billing of these two months the system has generated 1268 units for

**DESPATCHED**

**DATE** 10/6

09/2019 and 883 units for 10/2019 months respectively. The consumer is asking to reduce the bills stating that due to labour problem his saw mill was closed. Supply to the service connection No.5534503000343 is being utilized for the purpose of saw mill which is not a production unit. They have followed Clause No. 7.5.1.4.2 of GTCS to compute the average consumption. They have followed the above provision and taken 07/2019, 08/2019 and 09/2019 months average consumption and withdrawn an amount of Rs.1,021/- only. The service was disconnected for nonpayment of CC charges.

3. The point for determination is whether the bills issued for Rs.10,941/- in September' 19 and for Rs.8,352/- issued in October'2019 are liable to be revised?

The contention of the complainant is that he received CC bills for the month of August'2019 at Rs.4,127/- Rs.10,941/- for September'2019, for Rs.8,352/- in October'2019 and for Rs.2,430/- in November'2019 . He has stopped working of the saw mill due to labor problem. The service was disconnected for non-payment of electricity charges of September'2019 the bills issued for September'2019 and October'2019 are on high side and those bills have to be revised.

According to respondents the meter was stuck up during September'2019 and meter was replaced in the same month and meter replacement was effected during next billing cycle October'2019. The billing was done by taking average units for September and October'19 as per provisions of Clause No.7.5.1.4.2 of GTCS.

Clause No. 7.5.1.4.2 of GTCS is as follows:

*“If the conditions with regard to use of electricity during the periods as mentioned above were different, assessment shall be made on the basis of any 3 (three) consecutive billing cycles during the preceding 12 Months when the conditions of working were not different”.*

The account statement of the consumer shows from January'18 to December'18 the consumption is between 920 units to 459 units. Similarly the consumption of the consumer from January'2019 to August'2019 is in between 1438 units and 726 units.

The consumption was recorded at 260 units in September'19. Admittedly the meter was struck up and the same was replaced in the same month and replacement was effected during October '19 i.e. in the next month. Clause No. 7.5.1.4.1 and 7.5.1.4.2 of GTCS provides the procedure that has to be adopted with regard to the assessment of consumed units when the defective meter was replaced. The average consumption of the consumer for 3 months i.e. from July'19 to September' 19 (1028, 1319 and 1004 units.) i.e. 1117 units is taken for assessment of the consumption during the meter struck up period and raised the bill. Respondents have followed the provisions of Clause No. 7.5.1.4.2 of GTCS in calculating the units and the bill raised by them for the struck up period is correct. There are no merits in the complaint. The point is answered accordingly.

4. In the result complaint is dismissed.

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

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 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

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