

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

On this the 6th day of November 2019
C.G.No:155/2019-20/Vijayawada Circle

Present

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

Chairperson
Member (Technical)
Member (Finance)
Independent Member

Between

Y. Shivaji
3-47,
Peddapatnam,
Machilipatnam,
Krishna –Dist.

Complainant

AND

1. Assistant Accounts Officer/ERO/Machilipatnam
2. Deputy Executive Engineer/O/ Machilipatnam
3. Executive Engineer/O/ Machilipatnam

Respondents

ORDER

1. Complainant presented a complaint stating that he obtained Service Connection No. 6222343000612 in Mar '2018. He was paying bills regularly. But he received a demand to pay Rs.3,95,000/- in addition to electricity charges for the month of February'2019. The bill may be revised.
2. Respondent No.1 alone filed written submission stating that the service connection No. 6222343000612 was released under LT Cat -5 (C) Aqua culture on 14.04.2018 with contracted load of 95 HP . At the time of taking meter reading in the month of Feb'2019 respondent No.2 found that the Multiple Factor (MF) for the consumed units of that meter is 2, but the bill was issued from the beginning with MF -1, so the consumed units were decreased by half. It was happened due to mistake of entering MF particulars as '1' instead of '2' for the new service in the registers. Test reports and agreement (for Cat- 3 and 5 services) are not transmitted to the accounts department from any section since 2 years though it was brought to the notice of higher authorities every month.

A
DESPATCHED
DATE 13/11

C.G.No:155/2019-20/Vijayawada Circle

3. Respondents No. 2 and 3 did not choose to file written statements to the reasons best known to them.
4. The matter was heard through video conferencing held on 17.10.2019. In the video conferencing also only respondent No.1 was present and reiterated his version.
5. The point for determination is whether the disputed shortfall bill amount of Rs.3, 93,923.60 is liable to be withdrawn?

Respondent No.1 in his written submission clearly admitted that there was a mistake while entering the multiple factor for the consumed units of the meter. At the time of taking meter reading the Multiple Factor is recorded as '1' instead of '2' from the date of release of service connection. The written submission further shows that in spite of repeated information about non transmission of test report and agreement for cat- 3 and cat-5 services to the accounts departments by the operation department. The superior officers in the unit even did not take care to see that problem is rectified. Deputy Executive Engineer i.e. respondent No.2 who supposed to take meter reading though committed a mistake and this shortfall billing was happened due to lack of care at the time of taking readings did not choose to file written submission at all and failed to appear before the video conferencing . It clearly shows that he avoided both filing of written submission and appearing before the forum through video conferencing with a view only to avoid answers. It clearly shows that there is dereliction of duty on his part in this case. Had Deputy Executive Engineer has taken care to take meter reading appropriately and the accounts department insisted for transmission of test report and agreement at the time of issuing 1st bill, this problem would not have arisen. Simply the accounts department could not get over the responsibility for non transmission of test report and copy of the agreement and they ought not have raised 1st bill and they ought to have reported the matter in writing to the Corporate Office. When this mistake happened on the part of the employees of the Licensee, they ought to have informed to the consumer about wrong billing and negotiated him to pay the shortfall amount in installments. Instead of adopting this procedure, silently included the shortfall amount in the bill and insisted the consumers to pay the entire amount. Consumer represented that current electricity bills were also not collected on the ground that he had not paid the shortfall amount. It is not good on the part of the respondents for not allowing the consumer to pay the

