

**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-62 of 2013

Instituted On: 15.05.2013

Closed On: 25.06.2013

**Sh. Puneet Mehta  
36-B, Sarabha Nagar,  
Bhadson Road, Patiala.**

**.....Appellant**

**Name of Op/Division: Comml. Patiala**

A/c No.: **3000067855**

Through

Sh. Puneet Mehta, PR

V/s

**PUNJAB STATE POWER CORPORATION LTD** **.....Respondent**

Through

**Er. Surinder Loomba, ASE/comml. Divn. Patiala.**

**BRIEF HISTORY**

Petition No. CG-62 of 2013 was filed against order dated 13.03.2013 of ZDSC, South, Patiala deciding that the energy bill issued in 6/2012 on the actual consumption basis of 46916 units is correct and recoverable from the consumer.

The consumer is having DS category connection with sanctioned load of 11.540 KW operating under AEE/Comml. East Sub Division, Patiala. The consumer was billed for a period of 196 days (from 6.12.2011 to 18.6.2012) due to some fault in the billing system and energy bill amounting of Rs.2,75,200/- for 46916 units was issued to the consumer.

The consumer pleaded that energy bill of Rs. 2,75,200/- issued in 6/2012 for the consumption of 46916 units for a period of 196 days was on the higher side when compared with previous consumption. The consumer requested the Chief Engineer/South, Patiala that his case of excess billing be considered in the ZDSC. The ZDSC heard the case and decided that the amount charged to the consumer for 46916 units is correct and recoverable from him.

Being not satisfied with the decision of ZDSC, the consumer made an appeal in the Forum. Forum heard the case on 30.05.2013, 11.06.2013, 18.06.2013 and finally on 25.06.2013. Then the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

#### **Proceedings:-**

PR contended over jumping of meter of residential building; extra ordinary reading. It may be added I appeared before forum today 25.06.2013 kindly review my long pending case and provide me justice and relief and adjust the past deposit bills amounting Rs.55040/- i.e. 20% of total amount and Rs. 30.000/- another served bill against future power bills to be served under intimation to PR.

Representative of PSPCL contended that accuracy of the meter has been declared OK in the ME Lab. Further the consumer is high consumption consumer and the ZDSC has rightly judged the case. The reading of 21.09.2012 (7464) is the incremental reading taken by the SAP as the bill on that day was (f code). The reading on the SBM generated bill also of 21.09.2012 (2758) may be actual/system generated and cannot be relied upon. Therefore the amount as charged is recoverable. Both the parties have nothing more to say and submit and the case was closed for passing speaking orders.

#### **Observations of the Forum:-**

After the perusal of petition, reply, written arguments, proceedings, oral discussions and record made available to the Forum, Forum observed that the consumer is a DS category consumer with sanctioned load of 11.540 KW. In the month of June,2012 the consumer received energy

bill for 196 days amounting to Rs. 2,75,200/-. The consumer made an appeal in the ZDSC, Patiala and pleaded that his meter has jumped during this billing period. He further argued that he had never received such a huge amount of bill before and even after the change of the meter. The ZDSC decided that the consumption had been accumulated by the meter reader, so the amount charged is correct and recoverable. Forum observed that though the meter was checked in the ME Lab. and its results were found within permissible limits, however the jumping of meter reading cannot be ascertained in the lab in such like cases. It has also been observed that the incremental reading taken by the SAP on 21.09.2012 was 7464 units as the bill on that day was on 'F' code. The reading on the SBM generated bill was mentioned as 2758 units on the same date, for which bill was issued vide no. 0953043 dt. 21.09.12. The ZDSC in its decision dt. 13-03-13 has mentioned that consumption of the consumer after installation of new meter was recorded as 7463 units on 21.09.12 for a period of 93 days. However Addl.SE/Comml. Divn. Patiala has confirmed that this was consumption based on incremental reading and not the actual consumption. The consumption recorded for 2758 units on dt.21.9.2012 as per bill can be considered as actual consumption. Thus bi-monthly consumption works out to be 1809 units. Further the consumption recorded for the period from 20.06.12 (date of replacement of meter) to 16.05.2013 was 9114 units and bi-monthly consumption comes to 1660 units. It shows that the consumption recorded before the disputed period and after the change of meter was almost similar. However, the bi-monthly consumption during the disputed period i.e. 06.12.2011 to 18.06.2012 works out as 14600 units.

Forum is of the view that the behavior of the meter during the disputed period of 196 days was erratic. The consumption of 46916 units recorded in the period of 196 days for Domestic Consumer is not possible with connected load of 11.540 K.W. Further from the consumption pattern of previous period, the disputed consumption does not appear to be case of accumulation of consumption by

recording incorrect readings. The consumer's highest bi-monthly consumption recorded in the month of Aug.2011 is 2363 units. The bimonthly consumption recorded from April 2010 to Dec. 2011 varies from 805 units to 2363 units. Therefore, overhauling of the account during disputed period i.e. 06.12.2011 to 18.06.2012 on the basis of consumption recorded during the corresponding period of previous year is justified.

**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:

- **That the account of the consumer be overhauled for disputed period of 196 days on the basis of consumption of corresponding period of previous year.**
- **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