

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD
CONSUMERS GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
P-1, WHITE HOUSE, RAJPURA COLONY ROAD, PATIALA
PHONE: 0175-2214909 ; FAX : 0175-2215908**

Appeal No: CG-84 of 2013

Instituted On: 04.07.2013

Closed On: 16.08.2013

**Sh. Parminder Singh,
610, Phase-10,
Mohali.**

.....Appellant

Name of Op/Division: (Spl) Mohali.

A/c No.: UK 17/1314

Through

Sh. R.S. Dhiman, PR

V/s

PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTDRespondent

Through

Er. A.K. Sharma, ASE/OP. (Spl) Divn. Mohali.

BRIEF HISTORY

Petition No. 84 of 2013 was filed against the decision dated 08.05.2013 of DDSC, Mohali, deciding that the amount charged to the consumer on account of unbilled units as per final reading of meter replaced on 19.10.2011, is correct and recoverable.

The appellant consumer is having DS category connection bearing Account No. UK-17/1314 with sanctioned load of 9.96 KW, operating under Op. Division (Spl), Mohali.

The electro mechanical meter of the consumer was replaced with an electronic meter on 19.10.2011, vide MCO No. M11/2988 dated 25.08.2011. The final reading of the meter so removed was recorded as 42651. Similarly ME/Lab also accepted the meter at final reading of 42651. The consumer had paid energy bill upto the reading of 36166 recorded on 29.08.2011. The consumer was charged Rs. 34033/- as difference of unbilled consumption of 5663 units, after adjustment of consumption with new meter and units already billed in 10/2011 & 12/2011. The consumer was asked to deposit the amount of Rs.34033/- vide notice dated 27.09.2012 issued by ASE/Op. Mohali. The consumer did not agree to the amount so charged and referred his case for review by DDSC, Mohali.

The DDSC, Mohali heard the case on 08.05.2013 and decided that amount charged for unbilled consumption, as per final reading recorded on MCO/Store challan, is correct and recoverable.

Being not satisfied with the decision of DDSC, the consumer made an appeal in the Forum. The Forum heard the case on 18.07.2013, 06.08.2013 & finally on 16.08.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

Proceedings:-

PR contended that the petitioner's electro mechanical meter was replaced with an electronic meter on 19.10.11. The disputed amount of Rs. 34033/- is stated to be the bill for 6485 units shown consumed from 29.8.11 to 19.10.11 since the meter readings

recorded on 29.8.11 and 19.10.11 were 36166 and 42651 respectively. These readings may be correct but the consumption of 6485 units based on these readings is totally incompatible with the normal consumption of petitioner. This fact has been admitted even by the respondents that such a high consumption has not been registered during two years before and after the change of meter. The only explanation for this abnormal consumption is that either the meter reading has jumped during 29.8.11 to 19.10.11 or the figures of meter counter got disturbed at the time of dismantlement of meter. The final reading of meter was noted after its dismantlement. As such the possibility of counter figures getting disturbed during dismantlement is not ruled out. The abnormal consumption, therefore, needs to be corrected suitably in the interest of justice and fairness.

Representative of PSPCL contended that consumer is charged on the basis of final reading i.e. 42651 which is clearly mentioned in the challan issued by ME and as per the relevant record already mentioned in our early reply. It is further submitted that the consumption of 6485 units may be due to accumulation of readings in the previous period.

PR further contended that the theory of accumulation of consumption is not tenable as readings have been regularly recorded by the meter reader before and after change of meter for two years. Moreover there is no evidence on record that the meter reader has been recording wrong readings.

Observations of the Forum:-

After the perusal of petition, reply, written arguments, proceedings, oral discussions and record made available to the

Forum, Forum observed as under:-

The electro mechanical meter of the consumer was replaced with electronic meter on 19.10.2011 at final reading of 42651. The unbilled consumption as per final reading is 6485 units. The consumption during the year 2012 (during summer period), after replacement of the meter is in the range of 2200-2800 units per bi-monthly. And during winter period, it is 900-1100 units for two months. The consumer never challenged the accuracy of the meter and as such the accuracy was not tested in ME lab.

PR contended that consumption of 6485 units based on final reading of the meter is totally incompatible with the normal consumption. As such the possibility of jumping of reading of the meter during 29.08.2011 to 19.10.2011 or the counter figures getting disturbed during dismantlement is not ruled out.

PSPCL contended that the consumption of 6485 units may be due to accumulation of readings in the previous period.

Forum observed that consumption of 1602 units & 1391 units has been recorded during 05/2011 & 07/2011 respectively, whereas after replacement of the meter, the consumption during the same period of the year 2012 is 2860 units & 2214 units. Similarly the consumption from 11/2010 to 03/2011 is on the lower side as compared to consumption recorded during the same period of the year 2012. Therefore, the Forum is of the view that consumption of 6485 units for the period 29.08.2011 to 19.10.2011 is due to accumulation of consumption during the previous period and there is no possibility of jumping of reading of electro mechanical meter.

Decision:-

Keeping in view the petition, reply, written arguments, oral discussions, and after hearing both the parties, verifying the record produced by them and observations of Forum, Forum decides:

- To uphold the decision of DDSC Mohali taken in its meeting held on 08.05.2013.
- That the balance amount recoverable/refundable, if any, be recovered/refunded from/to the consumer along-with interest/surcharge as per instructions of PSPCL.
- As required under Section 19(1) & 19(1A) of Punjab State Electricity Regulatory Commission (Forum & Ombudsman) Regulation-2005, the implementation of this decision may be intimated to this office within 30 days from the date of receipt of this letter.

(Rajinder Singh)
CAO/Member

(K.S. Grewal)
Member/Independent

(Er. Ashok Goyal)
EIC/Chairman