

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

**On this the 25<sup>th</sup> day of September 2020**

**C.G.No:04/2020-21/ Anantapur Circle**

**Present**

**Sri. A. Sreenivasulu Reddy  
Sri. V. Venkateswarlu  
Sri. Dr. R. Surendra Kumar**

**Member (Finance)  
Member (Technical)  
Independent Member**

*Between*

Shaik Jeelani,  
C/o. Sania Beverages,  
10-316,  
Kothapeta (V)  
Jhanda Street,  
Gooty(M),  
Anantapur,

Complainant

*AND*

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

Respondents

**ORDER**

1. The case of the complainant is that he is having industrial service connection No. 7211121000350 for drinking water plant in Kothapeta (V) of Gooty (M). He is supplying RO process drinking water in Gooty . Production will be high during the months of March, April and May as they are summer months and people will consume more water. Production will fall from the month of June to February of next calendar year and that can be seen from monthly consumption.

During the month of July meter was found to be recorded high consumption than actual consumption and the issue was reported to the AEE/O/Gooty who replaced defective meter during the last week of August. After 10 days the meter was also found defective and it was replaced with the existing meter. The meter is working properly and being recorded correctly. During the change of meter, readings were not properly recorded by the staff for a period of 3 months between July '19 to

**DESPATCHED**

**DATE**

C.G.No.04/2020-21/Anantapur Circle

Page 1

26/9

September '2019. There was a lot of confusion about monthly consumption leading to audit point.

Complainant is requesting to average the consumption during the remaining 6 months of off season i.e. June to February of next calendar year for arriving the average consumption of the disputed three months. Consumer has also given consumption particulars from June' 19 to February'20 stating that total consumption units for 6 months as 22392 and average consumption per month is 3732. The consumption for the 3 months disputed period works out to be 11196 units and if the amount is calculated on that basis he paid an extra amount of Rs.12,168/- and the excess amount paid by him may be credited to his account. The additional demand of Rs.35,149.84 raised may be withdrawn.

3. Respondent No. 1 alone filed written submission stating that auditor has raised shortfall amount of Rs.35,150/- against the SC.No.7211121000350 LT Cat-III of Kothapeta (V) Gooty (M) for the months of July'19 to September'2019 during the internal audit for the month of October'2019 for meter change shortfall. On verification it is observed that in July' 18 and September'18 of previous year the complainant consumed 4791 units and 4600 units respectively and the meter was in healthy condition The auditor has taken average units in July'19 and September' 19 as 4755 units for the meter change period shortfall applied is correct. When there is defect in the meter they have to follow Clause No. 7.5.1.4.1 of GTCS for consumption of assessed units and they have assessed the units as per that provision only. It is observed that complainant has consumed an average units per month is more than 4300 units during the previous year 2018 billing pattern. Complainant is liable to pay the shortfall amount.
4. Personal hearing through video conferencing was conducted on 19.08.2020. Both parties reiterated their versions mentioned in their pleadings.

DESPATCHED  
DATE



5. Point for determination is whether the shortfall bills issued by the respondents for the months of July'19 and September'19 are liable to be revised?

The meter change slip shows that the meter was changed on 29.05.2019 again it was changed on 10.08.2019 and again on 11.10.2019. The bill details of the service number shows that bill was issued under '02' status in the month of May'19 and under status '11' in the month of Aug'2019. The closing KWH reading as on 08.07.2019 and opening KWH reading as on 09.08.2019 is 5006. The closing KWH reading as on 06.09.2019 is 608.

**July'2019 bill:-** According to respondents basing on the audit objection, bill was revised by taking average units of 4755 and raised shortfall bill for 1200 units. Respondents appears to have derived average units of 4755 units for calculating the consumption during the defective period in the month of July'2019 basing on the consumption of units in Feb, March and April'2019 i.e. 4051, 4742 and 5472 units respectively. The total units is 14265 and average units is 4755 units ( $14265/3=4755$ ). Admittedly the meter was changed on 29.05.2019 and the bill was issued for the month of June'19 basing on the prorata average units of 4755 per month plus actually recorded consumption totaling to 5095 units. So respondents have taken average of preceding 3 months i.e. February'19 to April'2019 as per the provisions of Clause No.7.5.1.4.1 of GTCS. Respondents have rightly taken average units of 4755 units. Hence complainant is liable to pay bill for the month of July'2019 taking average units as 4755 as consumption for the month of July billing and raising of shortfall bill for 1200 units (Average of 4755-3555 already billed) . The shortfall amount raised by the respondents for the month of July is correct and there are no grounds to interfere with it.

**September'2019 bill :** The meter was changed on 10.08.2019 on account of the meter is burnt the bill was issued for 763 units. Audit party objected for raising

bill for 763 units only. Hence the bill was revised for 4755 units and shortfall unit arrived @ 3942 (4755-763) . Admittedly the meter was changed on 10.08.2019. So the reasoning given by the respondents for raising shortfall units basing on the objection of audit party appears to be not reasonable. Respondents did not state on what ground the audit party raised objection and recommended for revision of bill for that month. The initial reading as on 10.08.2019 is 2.1 and final reading as on 06.09.2019 is 608. The final reading is taken on 09.08.2019 under '11' (Burnt) status. So it appears initially bill was raised for 763 units taking 157 units per one day i.e. for 09.08.2019 and the final reading of 606 (608-2) units. Admittedly the meter was in healthy condition from the date of change of the meter on 10.08.2019 till the date of taking final reading on 06.09.2019. So raising shortfall bill only on account of recording of less consumption in a healthy meter without any other supporting material is arbitrary and liable to be revised.

Complainant is requesting this forum to take 6 months average consumption from June'19, October to Dec'19 and Jan'2020 and Feb'2020 on the ground that July is an off season month for water processing units.

The relevant provision for assessing for revision of the bill is provided in Clause No. 7.5.1.4 of GTCS which is as follows:

*“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”.*



The above provision do not permit to calculate average units for a disputed preceding month basing on the consumption of subsequent months. No authority is placed by the complainant that bill for a particular month can be revised basing on the consumption recorded in subsequent months. Complainant is seeking revision of bill contrary to the provisions of GTCS .So the request of complainant to take average of subsequent period to arrive consumption of preceding months cannot be considered. So also the contention of complainant that July month is off season and consumption will be less when compared to consumption of March to June is not correct. It is well known fact that summer will start in the month of March and continue upto August and that too in Anantapur Dt. which is known to be one of the drought districts in Andhra Pradesh. Hence the request of the complainant is against the provisions of GTCS and cannot be considered. Thus the point is answered accordingly.

6. In the result respondents are directed to issue revised bill by withdrawing the bill for shortfall units of 3922 units for the month of September'2019 only. So far the revision of bill raising shortfall units for the month of July concerned is upheld. Respondents are directed to 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**, 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 25<sup>th</sup> September 2020.

Sd/-  
Member (Finance)

Sd/-  
Member (Technical)

Sd/-  
Independent Member

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 , 3<sup>rd</sup> 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, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Singareni Bhavan, Red Hills, Lakdikapool, Hyderabad- 500 004.