

THE ELECTRICITY OMBUDSMAN, UTTARAKHAND

Shri Ajendra Kumar
S/o Late Shri Rajendra Kumar
Singh Colony, Gali No. 5,
Rudrapur, Distt. Udham Singh Nagar,
Uttarakhand

Vs

The Executive Engineer,
Electricity Distribution Division
Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd.
Rudrapur, Distt. USN, Uttarakhand

Representation No. 10/2015

Order

The petitioner, Shri Ajendra Kumar has filed this appeal against the order dated 17.03.2015 of Consumer Grievance Redressal Forum, Kumaon zone (hereinafter referred to as Forum) in his complaint no. 109/2014 against Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd (hereinafter referred to as respondent), filed for correction of electricity bills and replacement of meter. Forum did not find merit in the complaint since the check meter which was finalized on 10.03.2015 confirmed that the meter is functioning correctly. The sealing certificate had the signatures of the petitioner, neither did he object to check report. As such the Forum found no ground for either changing the meter or correcting the bill. Aggrieved by this order petitioner has filed this appeal before the Ombudsman on 27.04.2015 and further revised it on 12.05.2015.

2. In his appeal the petitioner has explained that he has been regularly depositing dues as per electricity bills up to 20.02.2014 but after 20.02.2014 the bills suddenly increased and he requested the electricity division, Rudrapur to correct the bills. When no action was taken he was constrained to complain to the Forum. He has explained that since the Forum relied entirely on the fact that the check meter showed the same reading as the old meter no corrective action was called for, they did not examine any other evidence that he had placed before the Forum namely an analysis of the bills after 20.02.2014 revealing that the two month period ending 20.02.2014 had a consumption of 482 units whereas in the subsequent 2 months i.e. up to 20.04.2014 consumption

went up to 1803 and up to 20.06.2014 to 7005 units. Between 20.06.2014 and 05.07.2014 (a period of 15 days) a further 16234 units is shown as consumed. Hence he requested that his bills may be corrected and meter may be got replaced.

3. The respondent in their written statement dated 26.05.2015 have claimed that since the check meter finalized on 10.03.2015 has established the correctness of the meter no further action is called for. As per the billing history of the consumer in a period of 54 months he has consumed 33781 units which comes to an average of 625 units per month which is appropriate considering his sanctioned load of 6 KW. The respondent disconnected the connection on 05.02.2015 for nonpayment of dues. Date of disconnection (05.02.2015) appears incorrect as check meter was installed on 24.02.2015 and finalized on 10.03.2015. The petitioner has also disagreed with this date of disconnection and he has stated that it was disconnected on 08.09.2015 and also restored after depositing Rs. 200.00 (reconnection fees) + Rs. 75,000.00 on 11.09.2015. MRI was also taken on 08.09.2015.
4. On clarification being sought from the respondent regarding MRI report and Sealing certificate for enhancing load, respondent submitted a revised WS on 21.09.2015. Along with this they submitted a copy of MRI and a copy of application dated 09.09.2015 filed by the petitioner before the Executive Engineer on which part payment of Rs. 75,000.00 has been permitted. This is in response to the petitioner's allegation in his letter dated 16.09.2015 stating that the department has asked him to deposit the reconnection charges of Rs. 200.00 and part payment Rs. 75000.00. He also stated that a revised bill has been given to the petitioner and part payment against the revised bill has been made by him. Corrected bill for the period 20.04.2014 to 24.09.2015 for the reading from 19225 (already billed in the bill from 20.02.2014 to 20.04.2014) to 59326 (reading as per MRI) amounting to Rs. 1,71,895.00 was issued against which the petitioner paid Rs. 75,000.00 as part payment.
5. Hearing date was fixed for 08.09.2015 in which the respondent was present and the petitioner submitted an application that he does not want to be heard and case be decided on the basis of documents on file. Respondent submitted a supplementary written statement on 22.09.2015 which was made available to the petitioner with directions in case he wishes to be heard he may intimate the same. Petitioner again wrote on 05.10.2015 to say that he does not need personal appearance and his petition may be decided on the basis of documents on record.

6. The petitioner vide his letter dated 05.10.2015 has requested that his bill be assessed/issued either on 574 units (approximately) per month as per check meter report or at 625 units/month or 576 units/month as stated in respondent's letter dated 26.05.2015, after adjusting the amounts paid by him from 30.09.2010 to date as per details enclosed, without LPS. Further he has reiterated that he did not want to be heard personally, as he has already submitted all the documents. On examination and counter checking with consumer history, as submitted by the respondent, it has been revealed that all the payments claimed by the petitioner in his aforesaid letter already stand adjusted in the revised bill for the period 20.04.2014 to 24.09.2015 amounting to Rs. 1,71,895.00. An arrear amount of Rs. 6,325.00 existed in the bill for 04/2014, which does not appear in his own statement of payments made in past. As the above referred bill has been prepared as per actually consumed units, monthly average of which comes out to be 625 units, which is also acceptable to the petitioner, as stated in his above referred letter dated 05.10.2015 and he has also paid Rs. 75,000.00 as part payment against the said bill, this appears acceptable to him.
7. Having heard the respondent and perused the documents available on file the following conclusions can be drawn
- i. The meter of connection no. 892-A476-112046 was functioning correctly as per check meter report dated 10.03.2015.
 - ii. The revised bill for the period ending 24.09.2015 up to the reading 59326 as per MRI amounting to Rs. 1,71,895.00 issued by the respondent appears to be correct as it has been framed on the reading as per MRI and as the meter has been found working correctly.
 - iii. As such no relief is admissible to the petitioner.
8. The petition is dismissed. The Forum order is upheld. The petitioner has already paid Rs. 75,000.00 as part payment so balance is payable by him. If the petitioner fails to pay the amount due, the respondent may take necessary action for liquidation of dues as per Law/Regulations.

Dated: 19.11.2015

(Vibha Puri Das)
Ombudsman